



## Course Evaluation Results

### ACE 474 / ACE 474 UG - Economics of Consumption

Spring, 2025

Section GR, Lecture-Discussion (Jingru Jia)

T R, 2pm, 132 Bevier Hall

Evaluations were completed by **15** out of **53** students (28.3%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Large", a course type of "Required", and an instructor type of "TA".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

### Congratulations!

**You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!**

### Demographic Items

#### Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
-	-	40% (6)	47% (7)	13% (2)	-	-

#### This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
7% (1)	20% (3)	67% (10)	7% (1)

#### This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
93% (14)	-	-	7% (1)

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	53% (8)	40% (6)	7% (1)

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
7% (1)	60% (9)	27% (4)	7% (1)

#### Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
87% (13)	7% (1)	-	-	-	7% (1)

**Global Items****Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	20% (3)	27% (4)	47% (7)	7% (1)	<b>4.29</b>	0.83	56	76

**Rate the overall quality of this course. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	27% (4)	53% (8)	7% (1)	<b>4.43</b>	0.76	75	90

**How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little ... A Great Deal]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	33% (5)	53% (8)	7% (1)	<b>4.50</b>	0.65	83	90

**Departmental Core Items****ACE - TA****Was the T.A. enthusiastic about teaching? [Very Unenthusiastic ... Very Enthusiastic]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	33% (5)	53% (8)	7% (1)	<b>4.50</b>	0.65	49

**How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain? [Poor ... Excellent]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	27% (4)	20% (3)	47% (7)	7% (1)	<b>4.21</b>	0.89	35

**Was the T.A. a good speaker? [No, Rather Poor ... Yes, Very Good]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	7% (1)	20% (3)	13% (2)	53% (8)	7% (1)	<b>4.21</b>	1.05	41

**Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective? [Confusing, Inadequate ... Very Helpful]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	20% (3)	27% (4)	47% (7)	7% (1)	<b>4.29</b>	0.83	28

**How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course? [Never Available ... Available Regularly]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	20% (3)	60% (9)	7% (1)	<b>4.50</b>	0.76	53

**The T.A. maintained professional standards in creating rapport with students. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	20% (3)	67% (10)	7% (1)	<b>4.64</b>	0.63	47

**The T.A. promoted an atmosphere conducive to work and learning. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	13% (2)	13% (2)	67% (10)	7% (1)	<b>4.57</b>	0.76	48

**The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	27% (4)	60% (9)	7% (1)	<b>4.57</b>	0.65	44

**The T.A. motivated me to do my best work. [Almost Never ... Almost Always]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	33% (5)	13% (2)	47% (7)	7% (1)	<b>4.14</b>	0.95	27

**The T.A. was fair to students. [Seldom ... Often]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	7% (1)	13% (2)	73% (11)	7% (1)	<b>4.71</b>	0.61	39

#### Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					<b>4.29</b>
Rate the overall quality of this course.					<b>4.43</b>
How much have you learned in this course?					<b>4.50</b>
Was the T.A. enthusiastic about teaching?					<b>4.50</b>
How would you characterize the T.A.'s ability to explain?					<b>4.21</b>
Was the T.A. a good speaker?					<b>4.21</b>
Was the T.A.'s use of blackboard and other materials (handouts, etc.) effective?					<b>4.29</b>
How accessible was the T.A. for student conferences about the course?					<b>4.50</b>
The T.A. maintained professional standards in creating rapport with students.					<b>4.64</b>
The T.A. promoted an atmosphere conducive to work and learning.					<b>4.57</b>
The T.A. was conscientious about their instructional responsibilities.					<b>4.57</b>
The T.A. motivated me to do my best work.					<b>4.14</b>
The T.A. was fair to students.					<b>4.71</b>

= below 3.0 / = 3.0 - 4.0 / = above 4.0

#### ICES Open-Ended Items

**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- The major strength of the course is that the objectives and content was organized and clear
- TA went out of her way to schedule a separate time and room for me to make up an exam I missed for a job interview, and I really appreciated her support and flexibility. She did not need to take time out of her day outside of class.
- n/a
- She was helpful and always available.
- knowledge that i can use in the real world

**What do you suggest to improve the course?**

- The course could be improved with more examples on the slides
- nothing on TA behalf
- n/a
- N/A
- nope

**Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.**

- The grading procedures in the course is fair
- Fair
- n/a
- Great!
- good!