




## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

16F: ECON 106TL LAB 2A: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB  
 No. of responses = 11  
 Enrollment = 26  
 Response Rate = 42.31%


### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:


##### 1.1) Year in School:




##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:



##### 1.3) Expected Grade:



##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?




2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 9	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.73 md=9 dev.=0.65
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 8	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.82
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.45 md=9 dev.=0.82
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 7	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.36 md=9 dev.=1.03
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 8	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.45 md=9 dev.=1.04
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 8	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.73 md=9 dev.=0.47
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 8	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.93
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 8	Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.73 md=9 dev.=0.47


3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	0 10 1	High	n=11 av.=2.09 md=2 dev.=0.3
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	0 11 0	Too Much	n=11 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor	0 4 7	Excellent	n=11 av.=2.64 md=3 dev.=0.5
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor	0 3 6	Excellent	n=9 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.5 ab.=2
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor	0 2 8	Excellent	n=10 av.=2.8 md=3 dev.=0.42 ab.=1


3.6) Graded materials, examinations



3.7) Lecture presentations



3.8) Class discussions




# Profile


Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **16F: ECON 106TL LAB 2A: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

## 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:



## 3. Your View of Section Characteristics:



## Comments Report

## 4. Comments:

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Fan goes out of his way to answer questions and be of help to students. This is my second time taking a class with him and I think he does an exceptional job as a TA.
  - Fan is an Excellent TA. He really knows what he is doing and he gets directly to the point.
  - Fan was always very knowledgeable about the topics and was especially great help with regards to our presentations. He seemed to genuinely care about helping us with things that would particularly help us with our careers in the future and not just memorization. All in all, this was my favorite class at UCLA so far and Fan, the TA, was a major part of it.
  - He was very knowledgeable on consulting. Gave good advice on how to present and gave specific feedback on how to improve. His only weakness was time management as the class would often go over the allotted time.
  - Was very helpful




## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

16F: ECON 106TL LAB 2B: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB  
No. of responses = 11  
Enrollment = 24  
Response Rate = 45.83%


### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:


##### 1.1) Year in School:




##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:



##### 1.3) Expected Grade:



##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?




2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

2.1)	Teaching Assistant Knowledge – The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.64 md=9 dev.=0.67
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T. A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.69
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.69
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.69
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.64 md=9 dev.=0.5
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.69
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.55 md=9 dev.=0.69
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=11 av.=8.36 md=9 dev.=1.03

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:


3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=10 av.=2.4 md=2 dev.=0.52
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=10 av.=2.4 md=2 dev.=0.52
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=10 av.=2.8 md=3 dev.=0.42
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=7 av.=2.29 md=2 dev.=0.49 ab.=3
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=10 av.=2.7 md=3 dev.=0.48

3.6) Graded materials, examinations




n=10  
 av.=2.7  
 md=3  
 dev.=0.48

3.7) Lecture presentations



n=10  
 av.=2.8  
 md=3  
 dev.=0.42

3.8) Class discussions



n=10  
 av.=2.8  
 md=3  
 dev.=0.42




# Profile

Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **16F: ECON 106TL LAB 2B: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

## 2. To What Extent Do You Feel That:



## 3. Your View of Section Characteristics:



## Comments Report

## 4. Comments:

- <sup>4.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Fan is a very good and helpful TA. I appreciate his patience in explaining some of the concepts covered in class.
  - Fan was a great TA. He kept the sections fun and light, but making sure we knew the material. However, we always went over time. I wish that the grades for the section weren't so dependent on other teammates, because there are group members who are very set in their ways and cannot be changed, which ultimately effects the group.
  - He is the best TA I've ever got. He cares deeply for the students and encourages us to do better. He also gave excellent constructive feedbacks after our presentation which will be useful in the real life.
  - Thank you Fan
  - Thank you!!
  - The TA session was vey helpful and interesting to participate. Fan is an excellent TA. He gave our session valuable and insightful advices on presentation skills and analytical skills. The surprises in each session were challenging but fun to experience and were set to prepare us for the real world environment. Thank you for being our TA.



## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

17W: ECON 106EL LAB 1A: ECON ENTREP LAB

No. of responses = 3

Enrollment = 23

Response Rate = 13.04%

### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:

##### 1.1) Year in School:

Freshman	<input type="text" value="0"/>	n=3
Sophomore	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
Junior	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
Senior	<input type="text" value="3"/>	
Graduate	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
Other	<input type="text" value="0"/>	

##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:

Below 2.0	<input type="text" value="0"/>	n=3
2.0 - 2.49	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
2.5 - 2.99	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
3.0 - 3.49	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
3.5+	<input type="text" value="3"/>	
Not Established	<input type="text" value="0"/>	

##### 1.3) Expected Grade:


A	<input type="text" value="1"/>	n=3
B	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
C	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
D	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
F	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
P	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
NP	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
?	<input type="text" value="2"/>	

##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?


Major	<input type="text" value="3"/>	n=3
Related Field	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
G.E.	<input type="text" value="0"/>	
None	<input type="text" value="0"/>	

2. Preliminary Questions:

2.1) Approximately how many times did you attend the section?




2.2) You saw the teaching assistant attending lectures.




3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:


3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.




3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.




3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.




3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.



3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.



3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.



3.7)	Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.		n=3 av.=8.33 md=8 dev.=0.58
3.8)	Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.		n=3 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.73
3.9)	Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.		n=3 av.=7.67 md=9 dev.=2.31
3.10)	Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?		n=3 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.58

4. Your View of Section Characteristics:


4.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.2)	Workload/pace was		n=3 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0
4.3)	Integration of section with course was		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.4)	Texts, required readings		n=3 av.=2.33 md=2 dev.=0.58
4.5)	Homework assignments		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.6)	Graded materials, examinations		n=3 av.=2.33 md=2 dev.=0.58
4.7)	Lecture presentations		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.8)	Class discussions		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58

# Profile


Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **17W: ECON 106EL LAB 1A: ECON ENTREP LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:



### 4. Your View of Section Characteristics:



## Comments Report

## 5. Comments:

- <sup>5.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Didn't talk much to Fan, but he was very helpful during lab!
  - Fan made discussions very personalized and took the time to discuss each group's progress. However, I felt that there were many instances in which his advice conflicted with the advice given by the professor. This often made it confusing when actually completing the work, since our group was unsure what was the best way to approach our problems.
  - Fan was very helpful with the group assignments and presentations. He took the time to answer my questions and really wanted everyone to do well. Fan is an excellent TA!



## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report


17W: ECON 106EL LAB 1C: ECON ENTREP LAB

No. of responses = 9  
Enrollment = 25  
Response Rate = 36%


### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:


##### 1.1) Year in School:




##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:



##### 1.3) Expected Grade:




##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?






2. Preliminary Questions:

2.1) Approximately how many times did you attend the section?




2.2) You saw the teaching assistant attending lectures.




3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:


3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.




3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.




3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.




3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.



3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.



3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.



3.7)	Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.		n=9 av.=7.67 md=9 dev.=2.35
3.8)	Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.		n=9 av.=6.56 md=8 dev.=3.21
3.9)	Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.		n=9 av.=7 md=8 dev.=2.6
3.10)	Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?		n=9 av.=7.33 md=8 dev.=2.24

4. Your View of Section Characteristics:


4.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)		n=8 av.=2.25 md=2 dev.=0.46 ab.=1
4.2)	Workload/pace was		n=8 av.=2.38 md=2 dev.=0.52 ab.=1
4.3)	Integration of section with course was		n=8 av.=2.25 md=2 dev.=0.71 ab.=1
4.4)	Texts, required readings		n=8 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0.53 ab.=1
4.5)	Homework assignments		n=8 av.=1.88 md=2 dev.=0.35 ab.=1
4.6)	Graded materials, examinations		n=7 av.=1.71 md=2 dev.=0.49 ab.=2
4.7)	Lecture presentations		n=7 av.=1.86 md=2 dev.=0.38 ab.=2
4.8)	Class discussions		n=8 av.=2.13 md=2 dev.=0.64 ab.=1

# Profile


Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **17W: ECON 106EL LAB 1C: ECON ENTREP LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:



### 4. Your View of Section Characteristics:



## Comments Report

## 5. Comments:

5.1) Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.

- Fan is extremely helpful! He genuinely cares about his students and always answers our questions to the best of his ability. He is also really willing to give us feedback outside of class and ensure that we are learning well and are aware of the course structure and the course grading. He can take a while to reply to emails but he gets to them eventually! This is my second class with Fan as my TA and I would definitely recommend him!
- Fan seemed to be so much more insightful and knowledgeable about the subject matter than the Professor. Most of the time, I felt like Fan should have taught the course because he would always bring up good ideas and insights for my startup group to take into consideration of that was not mentioned or taught in lecture. I feel like he would've done a pretty solid job at giving the class a lecture on the concepts of entrepreneurship (which was NEVER at all taught in lecture).

Overall, the lectures of this course were all full of hot-head CEO guest speakers (except maybe 2 really humble individuals) that would give us advice on startup up that had no substance. For example, it really appalled me that it took 1 hour to get across one common sense point-- that a successful startup is one that maintains life-long customers. I did not pay UCLA \$4,000 a quarter for someone to go in circles of rephrasing things like an elementary school class to get across a simple concept that I believe comes naturally with intuition. I came into this class expecting to acquire actual entrepreneurship skills, not life advice or re-emphasis of how to be successful. It is absolutely ridiculous how much empty substance has been discussed in lecture that is common sense. It would have been great to learn about the types of strategies that support these common sense claims in entrepreneurship. Overall, the class was definitely not helpful but a good experience in getting in touch with the startup culture.

- Fan was a great help to my team and it truly felt like he cared about my learning and understanding. I felt that his instruction during section helped much more than the professor's guidance. Section was where I felt I was getting something meaningful from class.
- Fan was great. He was helpful and came up with constructive criticism about our project. He also was understanding about our problems, and was very knowledgeable about the material
- One of the best TA's in the Econ department. Very nice and knowledgeable.
- Thanks for not destroying our idea unlike Hugo did.
- This class is difficult to teach because entrepreneurship is not a cut and dry subject that can be taught in a classroom. My main problem with the TA specifically was the contradictory opinions that he gave when compared with the professor or our guest lecturers or Matt Pierce. I understand that everyone has different opinions, but it would be nice to have some consistency from the faculty. It also just seemed like the professor and TA did not really communicate with one another; neither seemed to know what the other was saying or doing. The TA especially was not able to communicate what the professor was thinking or wanted because he did not know himself. This whole situation just seemed incredibly disorganized and I was confused as to what we had to do in every section.
- communicate more



## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

17S: ECON 106DL LAB 1B: DESIGN MKT LAB

No. of responses = 9


Enrollment = 26

Response Rate = 34.62%


### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:


##### 1.1) Year in School:




##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:



##### 1.3) Expected Grade:




##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?




2. Preliminary Questions:

2.1) Approximately how many times did you attend the section?




2.2) You saw the teaching assistant attending lectures.




3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:


3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.




3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.




3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.




3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.



3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.



3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.



3.7)	Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.		n=9 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.71
3.8)	Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.		n=9 av.=8.44 md=9 dev.=0.73
3.9)	Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.		n=9 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.71
3.10)	Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?		n=9 av.=8.67 md=9 dev.=0.71

4. Your View of Section Characteristics:

4.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)		n=8 av.=2.25 md=2 dev.=0.46 ab.=1
4.2)	Workload/pace was		n=8 av.=2.25 md=2 dev.=0.46 ab.=1
4.3)	Integration of section with course was		n=8 av.=2.88 md=3 dev.=0.35 ab.=1
4.4)	Texts, required readings		n=8 av.=2.75 md=3 dev.=0.46 ab.=1
4.5)	Homework assignments		n=8 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 ab.=1
4.6)	Graded materials, examinations		n=8 av.=2.75 md=3 dev.=0.46 ab.=1
4.7)	Lecture presentations		n=8 av.=2.88 md=3 dev.=0.35 ab.=1
4.8)	Class discussions		n=8 av.=3 md=3 dev.=0 ab.=1

# Profile

Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **17S: ECON 106DL LAB 1B: DESIGN MKT LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.56
3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.56
3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.7) Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.8) Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.44
3.9) Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67
3.10) Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never																				Very High or Always	n=9	av.=8.67

### 4. Your View of Section Characteristics:

4.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low																				High	n=8	av.=2.25
4.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow																				Too Much	n=8	av.=2.25
4.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=2.88
4.4) Texts, required readings	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=2.75
4.5) Homework assignments	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=3.00
4.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=2.75
4.7) Lecture presentations	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=2.88
4.8) Class discussions	Poor																				Excellent	n=8	av.=3.00



## Comments Report

## 5. Comments:

- <sup>5.1)</sup> Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- An amazing person! He is the BEST TA I have ever met. Honestly speaking, the professor's lecture was vague and I didn't quite get the concepts, but Fan made it so much easier and clear during discussion. If it weren't for him, I wouldn't have gotten the concepts.
  - Fan is an outstanding lecturer. His discussions are well organized and extremely helpful. Two thumbs up for Fan. Three thumbs if I could. Thank you Fan!
  - One of the best TA's at UCLA. Fan is such a great TA. He really cares for his students and wants us to succeed. Glad I was enrolled in his session.
  - There were no weaknesses for this teacher assistant he did a fantastic job on expanding on the ideas discussed in the course.




## X. FAN Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

17S: ECON 106DL LAB 2C: DESIGN MKT LAB  
 No. of responses = 3  
 Enrollment = 26  
 Response Rate = 11.54%


### Survey Results

#### 1. Background Information:


##### 1.1) Year in School:




##### 1.2) UCLA GPA:



##### 1.3) Expected Grade:




##### 1.4) What requirements does this course fulfill?



2. Preliminary Questions:

2.1) Approximately how many times did you attend the section?




2.2) You saw the teaching assistant attending lectures.




3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:


3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.




3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.




3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.




3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.



3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.



3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.



3.7)	Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.		n=3 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.73
3.8)	Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.		n=3 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.73
3.9)	Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.		n=3 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.73
3.10)	Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?		n=3 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.73

4. Your View of Section Characteristics:











4.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)		n=3 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
4.2)	Workload/pace was		n=3 av.=2 md=2 dev.=0
4.3)	Integration of section with course was		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.4)	Texts, required readings		n=2 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.71 ab.=1
4.5)	Homework assignments		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.6)	Graded materials, examinations		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.7)	Lecture presentations		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58
4.8)	Class discussions		n=3 av.=2.67 md=3 dev.=0.58

# Profile





Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **X. FAN**  
 Name of the course: **17S: ECON 106DL LAB 2C: DESIGN MKT LAB**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

### 3. To What Extent Do You Feel That:

3.1) Teaching Assistant Knowledge - The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.2) Teaching Assistant Concern - The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.3) Organization - Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.4) Scope - The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.5) Interaction - Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.6) Communication Skills - The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.7) Presentation - Your presentation or your group's presentation benefited from the help of the teaching assistant.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.8) Data Analysis - The teaching assistant helped you develop data analysis skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.9) Value - The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00
3.10) Overall - What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=3	av.=8.00

### 4. Your View of Section Characteristics:

4.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=3	av.=2.00
4.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=3	av.=2.00
4.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
4.4) Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=2	av.=2.50
4.5) Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
4.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor		Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
4.7) Lecture presentations	Poor		Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67
4.8) Class discussions	Poor		Excellent	n=3	av.=2.67

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341201  
 Type: LAB 001A  
 Enrollment: 25

Processed: 20 forms... 80.0% response rate  
 02-12-2016 04:09:04

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 18		# valid responses: 17		# valid responses: 17		# valid responses: 16	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	58.82 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	29.41 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	11.11 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	88.89 %	3.0 - 3.49:	11.76 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	88.24 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	11.76 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	8	2	18	8.11	8.00	1.0				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	9	2	18	8.11	8.50	1.0				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	10	2	18	8.22	9.00	0.9				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	3	17	8.06	8.00	1.1				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	9	2	18	8.06	8.50	1.2				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	9	2	18	8.11	8.50	1.0				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	10	2	18	8.17	9.00	1.2				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	2	18	8.17	8.50	1.0				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	15	3	2	18
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	17	1	2	18
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	8	10	2	18
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	0	9	7	2	18
23. Homework Assignments	0	1	13	4	2	18
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	3	1	12	2	2	18
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	7	11	2	18
26. Class Discussions	0	0	10	8	2	18

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341203  
 Type: LAB 001C  
 Enrollment: 24

Processed: 10 forms... 41.7% response rate  
 02-12-2016 04:09:17

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 9	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	66.67 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	22.22 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	11.11 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	88.89 %	3.0 - 3.49:	33.33 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	66.67 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	11.11 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10	8.80	9.00	0.4			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	10	9.00	9.00	0.0			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	10	8.90	9.00	0.3				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	10	8.80	9.00	0.6				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10	8.80	9.00	0.4				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	10	8.70	9.00	0.5				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	10	0	0	10
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	9	1	0	10
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	3	7	0	10
22. Texts, Required Readings	3	0	3	4	0	10
23. Homework Assignments	0	0	4	6	0	10
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	0	4	6	0	10
25. Lecture Presentations	1	0	2	7	0	10
26. Class Discussions	0	0	1	9	0	10

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341212  
 Type: LAB 002B  
 Enrollment: 24

Processed: 11 forms... 45.8% response rate  
 02-10-2015 04:40:00

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 8		# valid responses: 8	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	62.50 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	25.00 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	0.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	100.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	33.33 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	66.67 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	12.50 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	9	8.44	9.00	0.9			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	2	9	8.67	9.00	1.0			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	2	9	8.44	9.00	1.0			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	9	8.11	8.00	1.1			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	2	9	8.33	9.00	1.1			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	2	9	8.44	9.00	1.0			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	2	9	8.33	9.00	1.1			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	8	8.50	9.00	1.1			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	7	1	3	8
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	7	1	3	8
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	4	4	3	8
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	0	5	1	3	8
23. Homework Assignments	2	0	3	3	3	8
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	0	5	0	4	7
25. Lecture Presentations	1	0	4	3	3	8
26. Class Discussions	1	0	3	4	3	8



Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341213  
 Type: LAB 002C  
 Enrollment: 26

Processed: 14 forms... 53.8% response rate  
 02-10-2015 04:40:08

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 14		# valid responses: 14		# valid responses: 14		# valid responses: 14	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	71.43 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	0.00 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	0.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	7.14 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	100.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	0.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	92.86 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	28.57 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	0	14	8.07	8.50	1.2				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	0	14	8.29	9.00	1.1				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	0	14	8.29	9.00	1.1				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	0	14	8.21	9.00	1.2				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	8	0	14	8.36	9.00	1.1				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	0	14	8.21	8.50	1.1				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	0	14	8.43	9.00	1.1				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	1	13	8.31	9.00	1.1				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	13	0	1	13
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	14	0	0	14
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	3	11	0	14
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	1	3	8	0	14
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	5	8	0	14
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	4	0	5	5	0	14
25. Lecture Presentations	2	0	3	9	0	14
26. Class Discussions	0	0	3	11	0	14

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341201  
 Type: LAB 001A  
 Enrollment: 21

Processed: 18 forms... 85.7% response rate  
 02-05-2014 03:25:29

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 18		# valid responses: 18		# valid responses: 17		# valid responses: 18	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	64.71 %	Major:	94.44 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	17.65 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	33.33 %	2.5 - 2.99:	5.56 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	66.67 %	3.0 - 3.49:	33.33 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	5.56 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	55.56 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	5.56 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	17.65 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	9	0	18	8.17	8.50	1.1			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	8	0	18	8.00	8.00	1.3			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	8	0	18	8.06	8.00	1.1			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	10	0	18	7.89	9.00	1.6			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	9	0	18	7.83	8.50	1.5			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	6	0	18	7.83	8.00	1.0			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	8	0	18	7.72	8.00	1.7			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	0	18	8.00	8.00	1.0			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	1	0	14	2	1	17
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	1	13	3	1	17
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	4	13	1	17
22. Texts, Required Readings	3	1	8	5	1	17
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	9	7	1	17
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	3	1	6	7	1	17
25. Lecture Presentations	2	0	6	9	1	17
26. Class Discussions	0	0	5	12	1	17

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: TECH&E-COMMERCE LAB 106TL ID: 180341203  
 Type: LAB 001C  
 Enrollment: 22

Processed: 10 forms... 45.5% response rate  
 02-05-2014 03:25:47

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 10	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	60.00 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	10.00 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	20.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	80.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	50.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	50.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	10.00 %		
				?:	20.00 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	10	8.70	9.00	0.7				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	10	8.80	9.00	0.6				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	10	8.50	9.00	1.0				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	10	8.70	9.00	0.7				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	10	8.80	9.00	0.6				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	10	8.70	9.00	0.7				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	10	8.70	9.00	0.7				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	10	0	0	10
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	9	1	0	10
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	2	8	0	10
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	0	4	4	0	10
23. Homework Assignments	0	0	6	4	0	10
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	1	0	4	5	0	10
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	4	6	0	10
26. Class Discussions	0	0	5	5	0	10

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: ECON ENTREP LAB 106EL ID: 180331202  
 Type: LAB 001B  
 Enrollment: 19

Processed: 17 forms... 89.5% response rate  
 04-28-2016 03:52:37

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 16		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	66.67 %	Major:	93.33 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	20.00 %	Related Field:	6.67 %
Junior:	25.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	75.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	26.67 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	73.33 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	13.33 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	17	8.29	8.00	0.8			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	0	17	8.29	8.00	0.8			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	0	17	8.18	8.00	1.1			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	0	17	8.24	9.00	1.1			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	0	17	8.53	9.00	0.7			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	0	17	8.41	9.00	0.8			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	1	16	8.38	8.50	0.7			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	11	0	17	8.41	9.00	0.9			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	15	2	7.00	7.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	1	8.00	8.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	15	2	7.50	7.50	0.7			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	15	2	7.50	7.50	0.7			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	1	0	12	1	3	14
20. Workload/Pace Was	1	0	8	5	3	14
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	8	6	3	14
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	2	9	1	3	14
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	8	4	4	13
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	1	9	2	3	14
25. Lecture Presentations	1	1	10	2	3	14
26. Class Discussions	0	1	5	8	3	14

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: ECON ENTREP LAB 106EL ID: 180331203  
 Type: LAB 001C  
 Enrollment: 21

Processed: 17 forms... 81.0% response rate  
 04-28-2016 03:52:44

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 13	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	80.00 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	13.33 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	26.67 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	73.33 %	3.0 - 3.49:	40.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	60.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	6.67 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	2	15	8.33	9.00	1.1				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	2	15	8.40	9.00	1.1				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	15	8.71	9.00	0.5				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	2	15	8.27	9.00	1.2				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	2	15	8.53	9.00	1.6				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	2	15	8.60	9.00	0.6				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	2	15	8.53	9.00	1.3				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	2	15	8.53	9.00	1.3				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	2	0	11	2	2	15
20. Workload/Pace Was	1	0	13	1	2	15
21. Integration of Section with Course was	1	0	7	7	2	15
22. Texts, Required Readings	3	0	6	5	3	14
23. Homework Assignments	2	1	8	4	2	15
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	3	1	7	4	2	15
25. Lecture Presentations	1	0	8	6	2	15
26. Class Discussions	1	0	5	8	3	14

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: ECON ENTREP LAB 106EL ID: 180331201  
 Type: LAB 001A  
 Enrollment: 19

Processed: 14 forms... 73.7% response rate  
 04-07-2015 11:46:36

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 14		# valid responses: 13		# valid responses: 13		# valid responses: 12	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	69.23 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	15.38 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	28.57 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	71.43 %	3.0 - 3.49:	15.38 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	84.62 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	15.38 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	14	8.43	9.00	0.8			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	0	14	8.64	9.00	0.6			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	0	14	8.29	9.00	1.0			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	0	14	8.50	9.00	0.9			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	0	14	8.71	9.00	0.6			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	0	14	8.57	9.00	0.8			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	10	0	14	8.43	9.00	1.2			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	1	13	8.46	9.00	0.8			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	11	1	2	12
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	12	0	2	12
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	8	4	2	12
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	0	8	2	2	12
23. Homework Assignments	0	1	9	2	2	12
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	0	10	2	2	12
25. Lecture Presentations	2	0	7	2	3	11
26. Class Discussions	2	0	6	3	3	11

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: ECON ENTREP LAB 106EL ID: 180331202  
 Type: LAB 001B  
 Enrollment: 24

Processed: 20 forms... 83.3% response rate  
 04-07-2015 11:46:44

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 20		# valid responses: 19		# valid responses: 19		# valid responses: 17	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	68.42 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	5.26 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	5.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	95.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	5.26 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	94.74 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	26.32 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	2	7	0	20	7.60	7.00	1.2				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	0	20	8.40	9.00	0.9				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	6	0	20	7.21	7.00	1.7				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	3	8	0	20	7.60	8.00	1.6				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	0	20	8.50	9.00	0.8				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	9	0	20	7.95	8.00	1.1				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	3	8	0	20	7.60	8.00	1.5				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4	9	0	20	8.00	8.00	1.1				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	1	16	3	0	20
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	15	5	0	20
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	12	7	0	20
22. Texts, Required Readings	4	0	13	3	0	20
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	14	5	0	20
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	0	15	3	0	20
25. Lecture Presentations	2	1	11	6	0	20
26. Class Discussions	2	0	13	5	0	20

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: INTRO GAME THY LAB 106GL ID: 180330211  
 Type: LAB 002A  
 Enrollment: 26

Processed: 18 forms... 69.2% response rate  
 07-16-2015 10:09:48

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 17		# valid responses: 18		# valid responses: 17		# valid responses: 16	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	64.71 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	5.88 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	11.76 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	47.06 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	11.76 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	47.06 %	3.0 - 3.49:	22.22 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	77.78 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	11.76 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	0	18	8.39	9.00	0.9			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	12	0	18	8.33	9.00	1.1			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	12	0	18	8.06	9.00	1.6			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3	10	0	18	7.89	9.00	1.6			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	12	0	18	8.22	9.00	1.3			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	12	0	18	8.17	9.00	1.3			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	10	0	18	8.06	9.00	1.3			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	11	1	17	8.12	9.00	1.3			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0.00	0.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	13	5	0	18
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	16	1	1	17
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	6	11	0	18
22. Texts, Required Readings	4	0	8	6	0	18
23. Homework Assignments	1	1	7	9	0	18
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	1	0	9	8	0	18
25. Lecture Presentations	2	0	7	9	0	18
26. Class Discussions	1	1	5	11	0	18



Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: INTRO GAME THY LAB 106GL ID: 180330213  
 Type: LAB 002C  
 Enrollment: 25

Processed: 21 forms... 84.0% response rate  
 07-16-2015 10:09:53

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 16		# valid responses: 16		# valid responses: 16		# valid responses: 16	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	62.50 %	Major:	93.75 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	18.75 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	37.50 %	2.5 - 2.99:	6.25 %	C:	6.25 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	62.50 %	3.0 - 3.49:	37.50 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	6.25 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	56.25 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	6.25 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	6.25 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	1	20	8.60	9.00	0.8			
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	15	1	20	8.50	9.00	1.0			
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	15	1	20	8.35	9.00	1.3			
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	15	1	20	8.45	9.00	1.1			
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	16	1	20	8.50	9.00	1.1			
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	14	1	20	8.35	9.00	1.2			
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	15	1	20	8.40	9.00	1.2			
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	16	1	20	8.50	9.00	1.1			
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	2	9.00	9.00	0.0			
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	9.00	9.00	0.0			

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	15	5	1	20
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	17	3	1	20
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	5	14	1	20
22. Texts, Required Readings	4	1	7	8	1	20
23. Homework Assignments	1	1	10	8	1	20
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	1	8	9	1	20
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	7	13	1	20
26. Class Discussions	1	0	6	13	1	20

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: MACRO ECON THEORY 102 ID: 180364221  
 Type: DIS 002A  
 Enrollment: 26

Processed: 10 forms... 38.5% response rate  
 07-18-2016 04:52:32

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 7		# valid responses: 7	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	42.86 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	28.57 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	88.89 %	2.5 - 2.99:	20.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	11.11 %	3.0 - 3.49:	40.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	40.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	28.57 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.8				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	0	10	8.50	9.00	0.9				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	0	10	8.50	9.00	0.9				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	0	10	8.60	9.00	0.7				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	9.00	9.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	7	1	2	8
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	7	1	2	8
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	3	5	2	8
22. Texts, Required Readings	0	0	5	3	2	8
23. Homework Assignments	1	0	4	3	2	8
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	0	4	4	2	8
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	4	4	2	8
26. Class Discussions	0	0	3	5	2	8

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: MACRO ECON THEORY 102 ID: 180364228  
 Type: DIS 002H  
 Enrollment: 24

Processed: 7 forms... 29.2% response rate  
 07-18-2016 04:53:27

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 7		# valid responses: 5		# valid responses: 6		# valid responses: 7	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	66.67 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	14.29 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	0.00 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	85.71 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	0.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	100.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	33.33 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	7	8.29	9.00	1.0				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	6	8.33	8.50	0.8				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	6	8.50	9.00	0.8				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	7	8.29	9.00	1.0				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	7	8.43	9.00	1.0				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	0	7	8.29	9.00	1.3				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	7	8.14	9.00	1.1				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	7	8.14	9.00	1.2				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	3	2	2	5
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	4	1	2	5
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	2	3	2	5
22. Texts, Required Readings	0	0	4	1	2	5
23. Homework Assignments	0	0	3	2	2	5
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	0	3	2	2	5
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	1	4	2	5
26. Class Discussions	0	0	2	3	2	5

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: MICROECONOMC THEORY 11 ID: 180052201  
 Type: DIS 001A  
 Enrollment: 30

Processed: 21 forms... 70.0% response rate  
 04-09-2014 02:25:28

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 21		# valid responses: 21		# valid responses: 21		# valid responses: 21	
Freshman:	4.76 %	Below 2.0:	4.76 %	A:	47.62 %	Major:	95.24 %
Sophomore:	66.67 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	23.81 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	28.57 %	2.5 - 2.99:	4.76 %	C:	4.76 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	57.14 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	4.76 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	33.33 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	23.81 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	0	21	8.24	9.00	0.9				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	14	0	21	8.48	9.00	0.8				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	0	21	8.38	9.00	0.9				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	1	20	7.90	8.00	1.2				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	13	0	21	8.38	9.00	0.9				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	11	0	21	8.10	9.00	1.4				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	12	0	21	7.95	9.00	1.4				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	1	20	8.30	9.00	0.9				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	1	1	13	6	0	21
20. Workload/Pace Was	1	0	18	2	0	21
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	8	13	0	21
22. Texts, Required Readings	5	2	9	5	0	21
23. Homework Assignments	8	0	7	6	0	21
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	2	1	13	5	0	21
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	8	13	0	21
26. Class Discussions	0	0	10	11	0	21

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: MICROECONOMC THEORY 11 ID: 180052208  
 Type: DIS 001H  
 Enrollment: 28

Processed: 15 forms... 53.6% response rate  
 04-09-2014 02:26:02

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15		# valid responses: 15	
Freshman:	0.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	33.33 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	86.67 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	46.67 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	13.33 %	2.5 - 2.99:	13.33 %	C:	13.33 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	53.33 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	26.67 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	6.67 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	6.67 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	0	15	8.13	8.00	0.9				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	9	0	15	8.07	9.00	1.5				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	7	0	15	8.00	8.00	1.3				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	6	0	15	7.73	8.00	1.2				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	0	15	8.07	8.00	1.2				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	7	0	15	7.93	8.00	1.3				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	0	15	8.07	8.00	1.2				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	6	0	15	8.07	8.00	1.1				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	8	5	2	13
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	0	11	2	2	13
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	1	5	7	2	13
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	5	2	4	2	13
23. Homework Assignments	2	1	4	6	2	13
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	3	6	4	2	13
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	8	5	2	13
26. Class Discussions	1	0	5	7	2	13

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: PRIN OF ECONOMICS 1 ID: 180004201  
 Type: QIZ 001A  
 Enrollment: 24

Processed: 10 forms... 41.7% response rate  
 07-02-2014 02:27:34

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 10		# valid responses: 9		# valid responses: 10	
Freshman:	40.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	22.22 %	Major:	40.00 %
Sophomore:	40.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	22.22 %	Related Field:	40.00 %
Junior:	20.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	40.00 %	C:	22.22 %	G.E.:	10.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	30.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	10.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	30.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	11.11 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	22.22 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	0	10	8.30	9.00	1.1				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	0	10	8.40	9.00	1.0				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	0	10	8.30	9.00	1.3				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	0	10	8.10	8.00	1.0				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	5	0	10	7.90	8.50	1.6				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	4	0	10	7.20	8.00	2.4				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	0	10	7.70	8.00	1.4				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	0	10	8.00	8.50	1.2				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0.00	0.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	0	7	3	0	10
20. Workload/Pace Was	1	0	8	1	0	10
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	5	5	0	10
22. Texts, Required Readings	2	0	6	2	0	10
23. Homework Assignments	4	0	4	2	0	10
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	3	1	4	2	0	10
25. Lecture Presentations	0	1	4	5	0	10
26. Class Discussions	0	0	5	5	0	10

Instructor: FAN, X. ID: 003985087  
 Department: ECON  
 Course: PRIN OF ECONOMICS 1 ID: 180004214  
 Type: QIZ 001N  
 Enrollment: 22

Processed: 4 forms... 18.2% response rate  
 07-02-2014 02:29:01

1. Year in School		2. UCLA GPA		3. Expected Grade		4. Requirement Fulfilled	
# valid responses: 4		# valid responses: 4		# valid responses: 4		# valid responses: 4	
Freshman:	75.00 %	Below 2.0:	0.00 %	A:	75.00 %	Major:	100.00 %
Sophomore:	0.00 %	2.0 - 2.49:	0.00 %	B:	0.00 %	Related Field:	0.00 %
Junior:	25.00 %	2.5 - 2.99:	0.00 %	C:	0.00 %	G.E.:	0.00 %
Senior:	0.00 %	3.0 - 3.49:	0.00 %	D:	0.00 %	None:	0.00 %
Graduate:	0.00 %	3.5 +:	100.00 %	F:	0.00 %		
Other:	0.00 %	Not Established	0.00 %	P:	0.00 %		
				NP:	0.00 %		
				?:	25.00 %		

Questions	Not Appl			Low				Medium				High		No Rsp	Rsp	Mean	Mdn	Std Dev	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
5. The T.A. was knowledgeable about the material.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4	7.75	7.50	1.0				
6. The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	8.25	8.50	1.0				
7. Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	4	7.50	7.50	0.6				
8. The T.A. expanded on course ideas.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	8.25	8.50	1.0				
9. Students felt welcome in seeking help.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	8.25	8.50	1.0				
10. The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	4	7.25	7.50	1.0				
11. Value of the sections justified time and effort.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	8.00	8.00	0.8				
12. Your overall rating of the T.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	8.00	8.00	0.8				
13. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				
14. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				
15. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				
16. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				
17. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				
18. Nonstandard Question.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	8.00	8.00	0.0				

Course Characteristics	Not Appl	Low	Medium	High	#No Resp	#Val Resp
19. Difficulty (Relative to Other Courses)	0	3	1	0	0	4
20. Workload/Pace Was	0	1	3	0	0	4
21. Integration of Section with Course was	0	0	1	3	0	4
22. Texts, Required Readings	1	1	1	1	0	4
23. Homework Assignments	0	0	3	1	0	4
24. Graded Materials, Examinations	0	0	4	0	0	4
25. Lecture Presentations	0	0	3	1	0	4
26. Class Discussions	0	0	2	2	0	4