

# Teaching Performance

Ta-Cheng Huang

National University of Singapore

November 2020

## 1 Teaching Philosophy

*“The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically.”*

— Martin Luther King Jr.

*“Tell me and I forget, teach me and I may remember, involve me and I learn.”*

— Benjamin Franklin

Living in this rapidly changing world, people need to have not only the basic reading and arithmetic skills, but also skills to think critically, to analyze what they observe, and to make inferences under with critical eyes. These skills are exactly what an economics graduate should learn when they walk out the college. My intention is to transform my passion for economics and knowledge about economics into a teaching environment that helps students to learn those skills in classes, and I am fortunate enough to have the privilege of teaching at Texas A&M and Texas State Universities to fulfill my goal.

*Make them think.* This simple statement sums up my first teaching philosophy. Rather than just presenting them formulae, theories, and results, teaching to me is about showing my students how to think and to think critically. To practice my teaching philosophy, I often pause in the delivery of materials to encourage my students to ask questions and walk them through the process of reasoning. One typical case is mathematical formulas, which are almost inevitable in teaching economics. Instead of just listing the formulas or asking my students to memorize them, I always invite them to *read between the formulas* and to think about the intuition behind them.

For example, in lecturing about how to determine the optimal weight in bonds of a two-risky-asset portfolio in the Financial Economics, I explained the rule in a very simple, intuitive fashion: Imagining that a bond and a stock are playing on a seesaw and they want the seesaw to balance. Then the question is how much weight should be on the bond and

the stock to balance the seesaw. I will never forget that one student approached me after the class and expressed how happy he is to understand a formula without memorizing it for the first time in college.

*Get their hands dirty.* Once the students learn the materials through critical reasoning, I challenge my students to examine the theories with real world data. Theories without support from empirical studies are just purely mathematical extensions. To this end, a properly designed homework assignment helps me to achieve this goal. For example, in the Intermediate Macroeconomics class, I proposed a homework assignment asking my students to verify which consumption function in the textbook is more realistic. Starting from collecting the data, I walk them through every single step to finish a well-reasoned empirical report. One of my student stopped by my office few months after the assignment and he told me that he just got an internship because of the skills he developed in the report: proposing a policy relevant research question, analyzing the data, and making inference based on the analysis.

As an instructor I strive to be patient, approachable, fair, and most importantly, passionate. My teaching evaluations and teaching awards sustain my belief that I am on the right track to achieve these goals. I received exceptional performance ratings in five courses which I taught as the primary instructor with full responsibility, and I also won the economics department's outstanding graduate instructor award in Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. These achievements are not periods but commas to motivate me to keep doing what I have been doing: training my students to think critically, to verify theories with real data, and to make wise decisions.

## 2 Plans for Future Teaching

My research interests span econometric theory, microeconometrics, and applied econometrics, so I am ready to offer courses in my research fields (undergrad or graduate level), such as

- Econometrics,
- (Applied) Microeconometrics,
- Financial Econometrics,
- Statistics for Economists,
- Data Analysis for Economists (Learning from Data via Machine Learning), and
- a special topic course on Program Evaluation.

Additionally, I have experience in teaching a variety of other courses at the university level, which including Money and Banking, Intermediate Macroeconomics, Financial Economics, and Principle of Microeconomics. Therefore, I can be a *swingman* to teach the following courses whenever the department needs me on any occasion,

- Money and Banking (two semesters teaching experience)
- Financial Economics (two semesters teaching experience),
- Introduction and Intermediate Macroeconomics (two semester teaching experience for the latter), and
- Introduction and Intermediate to Microeconomics (two semester teaching experience for the former).

### 3 Teaching Performance

Teaching assessments are the final piece to complete the puzzle of instruction, as they indicate whether or not the goals of education are being met. Instructors are inspired to ask the following hard but crucial questions about teaching from Course Evaluations: “Are we teaching what we think we are teaching?” “Are students learning what they are supposed to be learning?” “Is there a way to teach the subject more effectively and efficiently, thereby promoting better learning?” These questions can be *only* answered by the students.

I have been fortunate enough to be a teaching assistant and an independent instructor in a wide range of courses at Texas A&M University and Texas State University, and won award of outstanding graduate student course instructor in Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. Table 1 shows how my students evaluate my teaching in general. In addition to those ratings, here are some of the comments from Teaching Evaluations for the courses that I have taught to show how my students would answer those hardcore questions:<sup>1</sup>

“He made the classroom a very calm and easy place to sit down and listen to his lesson. It was also helpful how he had knowledge of the course to the extent that he was able to relate the real world effectively.”

— *Principle of Macroeconomics at Texas State, Spring 2018*

“He gave good examples and was always encouraging participation. He was always open to questions.”

— *Money and Banking at Texas State, Spring 2018*

---

<sup>1</sup>The original copies of comments are available upon request.

“The instructor obviously know the material very well and always come to class prepared. He did a good job of connecting the topic to today.”

— *Intermediate Macroeconomics at Texas State, Spring 2017*

“I think he must have good preparations before every class, because he can answer our questions and encourages us to show the doubts.”

— *Financial Economics at Texas A&M, Fall 2016*

“I really enjoyed the subject and I thought he was a great teacher. He explained well. The only issue was he went too fast during lecture.”

— *Macroeconomic Theory at Texas A&M, Spring 2016*

“On the whole, this was a great course and even better instructor. Classes were engaging and the instructor was very approachable.”

— *Financial Economics at Texas A&M, Fall 2015*

“TC was extremely genial and personable. It was very easy to ask questions in class and he was very patient and thorough with his problem explanantions. 10/10. You should make him teach this again.”

— *Math-Stat Boost Camp at Texas A&M, Summer 2017*

“TC is willing to work through problems and answer questions until everyone understand. ... I think TC would be a great professor in general.”

— *Math-Stat Boost Camp at Texas A&M, Summer 2016*

“TC is a very good instructor. He explains different material clearly. He is also extremely approachable, and always made me feel comfortable when I asked questions.

— *Math-Stat Boost Camp at Texas A&M, Summer 2014*

“Best TA I have ever had. Very personable, explains things in a way that people who have not studied econometrics for years can understand.”

— *Introduction to Econometrics at Texas A&M, Spring 2014*

Based on the abovelisted comments and Table 1, I am very confident in myself being an effective instructor and I would like quote my student in the early feedback for the course I am currently teaching to support my belief:

*“He is impressive and efficiently!”*

Table 1: Teaching Evaluation By Course<sup>1</sup>

Term	Course No.	Title	Size	Rating <sup>2</sup>
<b>Independent Instructor</b>				
<i>Texas State University, San Marcos</i>				
Spring 2018	ECO 2315	Money and Banking	66	4.40
Spring 2017	ECO 3315	Intermediate Macroeconomics	86	4.37 <sup>3</sup>
Spring 2017	ECO 2314	Principle of Microeconomics	111	4.39 <sup>3</sup>
<i>Texas A&amp;M University</i>				
Fall 2016	ECON 445	Financial Economics	54	4.63
Spring 2016	ECON 410	Macroeconomic Theory	66	4.20
Fall 2015	ECON 445	Financial Economics	51	4.52
<b>Teaching Assistant<sup>3</sup></b>				
<i>Texas A&amp;M University</i>				
Summer 2017		Math-Stat Boot Camp (PhD)	28	4.55
Summer 2016		Math-Stat Boot Camp (PhD)	28	4.94
Summer 2014		Math-Stat Boot Camp (PhD)	27	4.40
Spring 2014	ECMT 463	Introduction to Econometrics	46	4.86
Spring 2013	ECMT 676	Econometrics II (PhD)	26	4.98
Fall 2012	ECMT 675	Econometrics I (PhD)	27	5.00

<sup>1</sup> These courses were at undergraduate level, unless noted otherwise.<sup>2</sup> A standard agree/disagree, 5-point, fully-anchored scale is applied.<sup>3</sup> A simple average of two sections.<sup>4</sup> A teaching assistant is responsible for teaching weekly (or daily in summer) review sessions.

Texas A&M University, College Station  
FALL 2016

Report for the Instructor:

Huang, Ta-Cheng

Course Information: ECON 445 500

Total number of evaluations submitted: 39  
Total number of students enrolled in the class: 54  
Percentage of students who submitted an evaluation: 72%

A = Strongly Agree  
B = Agree  
C = Neutral  
D = Disagree  
E = Strongly Disagree

Mean Scores on A 5 Point Basis (A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E=1)

Overall Mean: 4.63

Question	N	Response Distribution										Mean
		A		B		C		D		E		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1 The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	39	32	82.1%	7	17.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.82
2 The instructor seemed to care whether the students learned.	39	26	66.7%	8	20.5%	5	12.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.54
3 The instructor seemed enthusiastic about the material that was presented.	39	27	69.2%	9	23.1%	2	5.1%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	4.59
4 The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	39	21	53.8%	9	23.1%	6	15.4%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%	4.23
5 The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.	39	22	56.4%	12	30.8%	5	12.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.44
6 The instructor adequately answered questions from students.	39	27	69.2%	12	30.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.69
7 I believe this instructor was an effective teacher.	39	25	64.1%	13	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	4.59
8 The exams/projects were presented and graded fairly.	39	32	82.1%	6	15.4%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.79
9 Help was readily available for questions and/or homework outside of class.	39	26	66.7%	12	30.8%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.64
10 On the whole, this is a good instructor.	39	32	82.1%	6	15.4%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.79
11 I would take another course from this professor.	39	31	79.5%	3	7.7%	3	7.7%	2	5.1%	0	0.0%	4.62
12 The course was well-organized.	39	26	66.7%	12	30.8%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.64
13 The course requirements were clear.	39	28	71.8%	8	20.5%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.64
reasonable for the credit hours received in the course.	39	30	76.9%	9	23.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.77
15 On the whole, this was a good course.	39	28	71.8%	10	25.6%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.69

Report for the Instructor  
Semester: FALL, 2015  
Course: ECON445  
Section: 500  
Instructor: HUANG TA-CHENG

Texas A&M University  
Department of ECONOMICS  
Student Ratings of Faculty  
Summarized by  
Measurement & Research Services

Total Option Forms: 31  
Overall Mean: 4.52

\*Mean Scores on A 5 Pt Basis  
(SA=5,A=4,U=3,D=2,SD=1)

Questions	Response Distribution												Mean*
	Usable	SA		A		U		D		SD			
	Resp.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
1. The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	30	21	70.0	8	26.7	1	3.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.67	
2. The instructor seemed to care whether the students learned.	31	22	71.0	7	22.6	2	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.65	
3. The instructor seemed enthusiastic about the material that was presented.	31	21	67.7	8	25.8	2	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.61	
4. The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	31	16	51.6	9	29.0	4	12.9	1	3.2	1	3.2	4.23	
5. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.	31	14	45.2	12	38.7	4	12.9	1	3.2	0	0.0	4.26	
6. The instructor adequately answered questions from students.	31	20	64.5	9	29.0	2	6.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.58	
7. I believe this instructor was an effective teacher.	31	16	51.6	12	38.7	3	9.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.42	
8. The exams/projects were presented and graded fairly.	31	28	90.3	3	9.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.90	
9. Help was readily available for questions and/or homework outside of class.	31	19	61.3	9	29.0	3	9.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.52	
10. On the whole, this is a good instructor.	31	22	71.0	8	25.8	0	0.0	1	3.2	0	0.0	4.65	
11. I would take another course from this professor.	31	19	61.3	6	19.4	4	12.9	2	6.5	0	0.0	4.35	
12. The course was well-organized.	31	16	51.6	12	38.7	2	6.5	1	3.2	0	0.0	4.39	
13. The course requirements were clear.	31	23	74.2	5	16.1	2	6.5	0	0.0	1	3.2	4.58	
14. The amount of work and/or reading was reasonable for the credit hours received in the course.	31	21	67.7	8	25.8	1	3.2	1	3.2	0	0.0	4.58	
15. On the whole, this was a good course.	31	19	61.3	8	25.8	3	9.7	1	3.2	0	0.0	4.45	

Report for the Instructor  
Semester: Spring, 2016  
Course: ECON410  
Section: 500  
Instructor: HUANG TA-CHENG

Texas A&M University  
Department of ECONOMICS  
Student Ratings of Faculty  
Summarized by  
Measurement & Research Services

Total Option Forms: 49  
Overall Mean: 4.20

\*Mean Scores on A 5 Pt Basis  
(SA=5,A=4,U=3,D=2,SD=1)

Questions	Response Distribution												Mean*
	Usable	SA		A		U		D		SD			
	Resp.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
1. The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	49	28	57.1	18	36.7	3	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.51	
2. The instructor seemed to care whether the students learned.	49	26	53.1	17	34.7	6	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.41	
3. The instructor seemed enthusiastic about the material that was presented.	49	24	49.0	14	28.6	11	22.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.27	
4. The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	49	14	28.6	10	20.4	13	26.5	8	16.3	4	8.2	3.45	
5. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.	49	15	30.6	15	30.6	9	18.4	8	16.3	2	4.1	3.67	
6. The instructor adequately answered questions from students.	49	26	53.1	14	28.6	7	14.3	2	4.1	0	0.0	4.31	
7. I believe this instructor was an effective teacher.	49	17	34.7	14	28.6	7	14.3	9	18.4	2	4.1	3.71	
8. The exams/projects were presented and graded fairly.	48	36	75.0	7	14.6	5	10.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.65	
9. Help was readily available for questions and/or homework outside of class.	49	29	59.2	14	28.6	6	12.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.47	
10. On the whole, this is a good instructor.	49	19	38.8	17	34.7	7	14.3	6	12.2	0	0.0	4.00	
11. I would take another course from this professor.	49	24	49.0	9	18.4	7	14.3	3	6.1	6	12.2	3.86	
12. The course was well-organized.	49	23	46.9	18	36.7	8	16.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.31	
13. The course requirements were clear.	49	35	71.4	11	22.4	3	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.65	
14. The amount of work and/or reading was reasonable for the credit hours received in the course.	49	36	73.5	12	24.5	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.71	
15. On the whole, this was a good course.	47	20	42.6	13	27.7	9	19.1	3	6.4	2	4.3	3.98	



Report for the Instructor  
Semester: Spring, 2014  
Course: ECMT463  
Section: 905  
Instructor: ~~HONG HAPSHIN~~

Texas A&M University  
Department of ECONOMICS  
Student Ratings of Faculty  
Summarized by  
Measurement & Research Services

Total Option Forms: 12  
Overall Mean: 4.90

\*Mean Scores on A 5 Pt Basis  
(SA=5,A=4,U=3,D=2,SD=1)

*LAB*  
*Huang, Ta-Cheng*

Questions	Response Distribution												Mean*
	Usable	SA		A		U		D		SD			
	Resp.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
1. The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.91	
2. The instructor seemed to care whether the students learned.	11	11	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5.00	
3. The instructor seemed enthusiastic about the material that was presented.	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.91	
4. The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	12	8	66.7	4	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.67	
5. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.	11	11	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5.00	
6. The instructor adequately answered questions from students.	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.91	
7. I believe this instructor was an effective teacher.	11	11	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5.00	
8. The exams/projects were presented and graded fairly.	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.82	
9. Help was readily available for questions and/or homework outside of class.	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.91	
10. On the whole, this is a good instructor.	11	11	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5.00	
11. I would take another course from this professor.	11	11	100	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5.00	
12. The course was well-organized.	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.82	
13. The course requirements were clear.	11	9	81.8	2	18.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.82	
14. The amount of work and/or reading was reasonable for the credit hours received in the course.	11	10	90.9	1	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.91	
15. On the whole, this was a good course.	10	9	90.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.80	

Report for the Instructor

Semester: Spring, 2014

Course: ECMT463

Section: 906

Instructor: ~~HUANG HUA-SHIN~~

Texas A&M University  
Department of ECONOMICS  
Student Ratings of Faculty

Summarized by  
Measurement & Research Services

Total Option Forms: 13

Overall Mean: 4.82

\*Mean Scores on A 5 Pt Basis  
(SA=5,A=4,U=3,D=2,SD=1)

Questions	Response Distribution												Mean*
	Usable	SA		A		U		D		SD			
	Resp.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.		
1. The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.92	
2. The instructor seemed to care whether the students learned.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
3. The instructor seemed enthusiastic about the material that was presented.	13	12	92.3	0	0.0	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
4. The instructor stimulated my interest in the subject.	13	11	84.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	4.54	
5. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
6. The instructor adequately answered questions from students.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
7. I believe this instructor was an effective teacher.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
8. The exams/projects were presented and graded fairly.	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.92	
9. Help was readily available for questions and/or homework outside of class.	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.77	
10. On the whole, this is a good instructor.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
11. I would take another course from this professor.	13	11	84.6	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.69	
12. The course was well-organized.	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.77	
13. The course requirements were clear.	13	11	84.6	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.85	
14. The amount of work and/or reading was reasonable for the credit hours received in the course.	13	12	92.3	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.92	
15. On the whole, this was a good course.	13	11	84.6	1	7.7	1	7.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.77	

FINANCE &amp; ECONOMICS

Course Section Evaluation Report

Date: 5/18/2017

Provided as a free service by TREC since 1986 Source: evalspl7fin95

Evaluation for: 2314 . 256 HUANG

All course levels

Item(s) 1- 19 had 5 response options (A,B,C,D,E)

Q	E	Frequencies				Mean			Valid Responses			Standard Deviation			Q
		D	C	B	A	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	
1	0	0	5	13	11	4.21	4.19	4.44	29	357	2848	0.73	0.94	0.84	1
2	0	0	5	11	12	4.25	4.37	4.46	28	357	2850	0.75	0.78	0.80	2
3	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	4.39	4.51	28	357	2851	0.69	0.76	0.78	3
4	0	0	3	10	16	4.45	4.61	4.68	29	356	2849	0.69	0.60	0.59	4
5	0	0	4	9	16	4.41	4.40	4.55	29	356	2848	0.73	0.78	0.74	5
6	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	4.50	4.54	29	357	2849	0.62	0.76	0.79	6
7	0	0	4	12	13	4.31	4.20	4.37	29	355	2845	0.71	0.97	0.93	7
8	0	0	5	7	16	4.39	4.36	4.53	28	357	2845	0.79	0.88	0.79	8
9	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	4.45	4.55	28	357	2849	0.63	0.76	0.79	9
10	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	4.36	4.54	29	357	2841	0.77	0.78	0.75	10
11	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	4.18	4.53	29	357	2847	0.68	0.92	0.79	11
12	0	0	1	11	16	4.54	4.44	4.49	28	357	2843	0.58	0.78	0.83	12
13	0	0	1	10	17	4.57	4.56	4.65	28	356	2843	0.57	0.69	0.64	13
14	0	0	7	10	11	4.14	4.33	4.49	28	355	2829	0.80	0.81	0.76	14
15	0	1	4	11	12	4.21	4.19	4.42	28	356	2843	0.83	0.87	0.80	15
16	0	1	8	9	10	4.00	4.14	4.38	28	357	2834	0.90	0.94	0.92	16
17	2	1	9	10	6	3.61	3.87	4.07	28	347	2789	1.10	0.98	1.02	17
18	21	3	0	1	1	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									18
19	5	4	1	4	10	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									19

Subsections (sub-scales) - Evaluations with missing responses removed from subscale

Overall {} 0.00|....|.... 0| 0|....

Subsection (1-16) 4.35|4.36|4.51 27| 350|2784

FINANCE &amp; ECONOMICS

## Course Section Evaluation Report

Date: 5/18/2017

Provided as a free service by TREC since 1986 Source: evalsp17fin95

Evaluation for: 2314 . 261 HUANG

All course levels

Item(s) 1- 19 had 5 response options (A,B,C,D,E)

Q	E	Frequencies				Mean			Valid Responses			Standard Deviation			Q
		D	C	B	A	Sect	Crse	Dept	Sect	Crse	Dept	Sect	Crse	Dept	
1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	4.19	4.44	13	373	2864	0.69	0.94	0.84	1
2	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	4.37	4.46	13	372	2865	0.69	0.78	0.80	2
3	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	4.39	4.51	13	372	2866	0.65	0.76	0.78	3
4	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	4.62	4.68	13	372	2865	1.12	0.60	0.59	4
5	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	4.40	4.55	13	372	2864	0.51	0.78	0.74	5
6	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	4.51	4.54	13	373	2865	0.52	0.76	0.79	6
7	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	4.21	4.37	13	371	2861	0.73	0.97	0.93	7
8	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	4.35	4.53	13	372	2860	0.52	0.88	0.79	8
9	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	4.46	4.55	13	372	2864	0.66	0.76	0.79	9
10	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	4.36	4.54	13	373	2857	0.65	0.78	0.75	10
11	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	4.19	4.53	13	373	2863	0.77	0.92	0.79	11
12	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	4.44	4.49	13	372	2858	0.51	0.78	0.83	12
13	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	4.55	4.65	13	371	2858	0.44	0.69	0.64	13
14	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	4.32	4.49	13	370	2844	0.66	0.81	0.76	14
15	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	4.18	4.42	13	371	2858	0.52	0.87	0.80	15
16	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	4.13	4.38	13	372	2849	1.08	0.94	0.92	16
17	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	3.85	4.07	13	362	2804	0.93	0.98	1.02	17
18	10	1	0	0	2	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									18
19	4	3	0	1	4	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									19

Subsections (sub-scales) - Evaluations with missing responses removed from subscale

Overall () 0.00|....|.... 0| 0|....

Subsection (1-16) 4.38|4.36|4.51 13| 364|2798

## FINANCE &amp; ECONOMICS

## Course Section Evaluation Report

Date: 5/18/2017

Provided as a free service by TREC since 1986 Source: evalsp17fin95

Evaluation for: 3315 . 251 HUANG

All course levels

Item(s) 1- 19 had 5 response options (A,B,C,D,E)

Q	E	Frequencies				Mean			Valid Responses			Standard Deviation			Q
		D	C	B	A	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	
1	1	3	3	8	17	4.16	4.27	4.44	32	7	2845	1.14	1.05	0.84	1
2	1	1	5	9	16	4.19	4.30	4.46	32	7	2846	1.03	0.95	0.80	2
3	1	1	2	10	18	4.34	4.01	4.51	32	7	2847	0.97	1.00	0.78	3
4	1	2	3	10	16	4.19	4.58	4.69	32	7	2846	1.06	0.99	0.59	4
5	1	2	2	7	20	4.34	4.45	4.55	32	7	2845	1.07	0.99	0.74	5
6	1	1	1	12	17	4.34	4.73	4.54	32	7	2846	0.94	0.88	0.79	6
7	1	5	3	6	17	4.03	4.03	4.37	32	7	2842	1.26	1.22	0.93	7
8	1	2	2	8	19	4.31	4.70	4.53	32	7	2841	1.06	0.99	0.79	8
9	1	0	3	6	22	4.50	4.83	4.55	32	7	2845	0.92	0.85	0.79	9
10	1	2	5	7	17	4.16	4.72	4.54	32	7	2838	1.11	1.04	0.75	10
11	1	2	4	7	18	4.22	5.00	4.53	32	7	2844	1.10	1.04	0.79	11
12	1	0	0	13	18	4.47	4.97	4.49	32	7	2839	0.80	0.75	0.83	12
13	1	1	3	8	19	4.34	5.01	4.65	32	7	2839	1.00	0.94	0.64	13
14	1	1	7	4	19	4.22	4.66	4.49	32	6	2825	1.10	1.04	0.76	14
15	2	2	4	6	18	4.12	4.45	4.42	32	7	2839	1.24	1.21	0.80	15
16	2	3	3	4	19	4.13	4.29	4.38	31	7	2831	1.31	1.26	0.92	16
17	0	3	8	9	11	3.90	4.21	4.07	31	6	2786	1.01	0.97	1.02	17
18	5	13	12	0	0	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.						18			
19	20	0	2	0	2	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.						19			

Subsections (sub-scales) - Evaluations with missing responses removed from subscale

Overall () 0.00|....|.... 0| 0|....

Subsection (1-16) 4.24|4.54|4.51 31| 6|2780



## FINANCE &amp; ECONOMICS

## Course Section Evaluation Report

Date: 5/18/2017

Provided as a free service by TREC since 1986 Source: evalspl7fin95

Evaluation for: 3315 . 252 HUANG

All course levels

Item(s) 1- 19 had 5 response options (A,B,C,D,E)

Q	E	Frequencies				Mean			Valid Responses			Standard Deviation			Q
		D	C	B	A	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	Sect	Crs	Dept	
1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	4.16	4.44	7	32	2870	0.49	1.05	0.84	1
2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	4.19	4.46	7	32	2871	0.49	0.95	0.80	2
3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	4.34	4.51	7	32	2872	1.15	1.00	0.78	3
4	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	4.19	4.68	7	32	2871	0.53	0.99	0.59	4
5	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	4.34	4.55	7	32	2870	0.53	0.99	0.74	5
6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	4.34	4.54	7	32	2871	0.49	0.88	0.79	6
7	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	4.04	4.37	7	32	2867	1.15	1.22	0.93	7
8	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	4.31	4.53	7	32	2866	0.49	0.99	0.79	8
9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	4.49	4.55	7	32	2870	0.38	0.85	0.79	9
10	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	4.16	4.54	7	32	2863	0.49	1.04	0.75	10
11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	4.22	4.53	7	32	2869	0.00	1.04	0.79	11
12	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	4.46	4.49	7	32	2864	0.00	0.75	0.83	12
13	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	4.34	4.65	7	32	2864	0.00	0.94	0.64	13
14	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	4.22	4.49	6	32	2851	0.52	1.04	0.76	14
15	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	4.13	4.42	7	32	2864	1.13	1.21	0.80	15
16	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	4.13	4.38	7	31	2855	1.11	1.26	0.92	16
17	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	3.91	4.07	6	31	2811	0.75	0.97	1.02	17
18	0	3	2	0	0	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									18
19	2	0	0	0	0	Mean and Standard Deviation not appropriate.									19

Subsections (sub-scales) - Evaluations with missing responses removed from subscale

Overall () 0.00|....|.... 0| 0|....

Subsection (1-16) 4.54|4.24|4.51 6| 31|2805