

3. Teaching Evaluation

Table 1. Summary Statistics of Teaching Evaluation (Industrial Organization-Yuanting Wu)

	Summer 2018 Enrollment= 31		Spring 2018 Enrollment= 73		Fall 2017 Enrollment= 79	
	My Course	Department Ave	My Course	Department Ave	My Course	Department Ave
1. The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner.	4.38	4.5	3.72	4.34	3.76	4.38
2. The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions.	4.63	4.4	3.77	4.22	3.68	4.28
3. The instructor generated interest in the course material.	4.75	4.35	3.74	4.09	3.56	4.13
4. The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material.	4.5	4.53	4.24	4.31	3.82	4.36
5. The instructor assigned grades fairly.	4.5	4.46	4.13	4.34	3.76	4.34
6. The instructional methods encouraged student learning.	4.63	4.2	3.68	3.99	3.32	4.00
7. I learned a great deal in this course.	4.5	4.31	3.67	4.08	3.50	4.09
8. I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course.	4.5	3.88	3.67	3.81	3.56	3.83
9. I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as:	4.63	4.2	3.62	4.02	3.35	4.04
10. I rate the overall quality of the course as:	4.5	4.18	3.62	4.02	3.38	4.02

Notes: All the results are anonymously generated online through the Student Instructional Rating Survey (SIRS) of Rutgers University. Rutgers uses a 5-point scale for teaching evaluations ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree for questions 1 through 8 and ranging from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for question 9 and 10.

Source: SIRS results of Yuanting Wu. The original SIRS results (attached below) can be found in <https://ctaar.rutgers.edu/sirs/>.

Table 2. Summary Statistics of Teaching Evaluation (MONEY, BANKING AND THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM-Yuanting Wu)

	Spring 2017 Enrollment= 75		Summer 2017 Enrollment= 13		Summer 2016 Enrollment= 10	
	My Course	Department Ave	My Course	Department Ave	My Course	Department Ave
1. The instructor was prepared for class and presented the material in an organized manner.	4.00	4.30	3.67	4.46	5.00	4.41
2. The instructor responded effectively to student comments and questions.	3.80	4.10	4.67	4.4	5.00	4.34
3. The instructor generated interest in the course material.	3.60	3.90	4.67	4.36	3.00	4.16
4. The instructor had a positive attitude toward assisting all students in understanding course material.	4.30	4.20	5.00	4.54	5.00	4.39
5. The instructor assigned grades fairly.	4.40	4.20	4.67	4.47	5.00	4.39
6. The instructional methods encouraged student learning.	3.60	3.80	4.67	4.21	4.00	4.07
7. I learned a great deal in this course.	3.70	3.90	4.33	4.34	3.00	4.13
8. I had a strong prior interest in the subject matter and wanted to take this course.	3.90	3.80	4.00	3.82	3.00	3.79
9. I rate the teaching effectiveness of the instructor as:	3.60	3.90	4.33	4.23	5.00	4.11
10. I rate the overall quality of the course as:	3.70	3.90	4.33	4.21	5.00	4.07

Notes: All the results are anonymously generated online through the Student Instructional Rating Survey (SIRS) of Rutgers University. Rutgers uses a 5-point scale for teaching evaluations ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree for questions 1 through 8 and ranging from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) for question 9 and 10.

Source: SIRS results of Yuanting Wu. The original SIRS results (attached below) can be found in <https://ctaar.rutgers.edu/sirs/>.