



## C. SURRO Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

16F: ECON 2 DIS 1F: PRIN OF ECONOMICS

No. of responses = 12


Enrollment = 23

Response Rate = 52.17%

### 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.		n=12 av.=8.08 md=9 dev.=1.56
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.		n=12 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.41
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.		n=11 av.=7.73 md=9 dev.=2 ab.=1
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.		n=12 av.=8.08 md=9 dev.=1.56
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.		n=11 av.=8.27 md=9 dev.=1.27 ab.=1
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.		n=12 av.=8.08 md=9 dev.=1.31
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.		n=11 av.=8 md=9 dev.=1.61 ab.=1
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?		n=12 av.=8.17 md=9 dev.=1.4

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:


3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)		n=12 av.=1.92 md=2 dev.=0.29
3.2)	Workload/pace was		n=12 av.=2.08 md=2 dev.=0.29
3.3)	Integration of section with course was		n=12 av.=2.33 md=2 dev.=0.49
3.4)	Texts, required readings		n=12 av.=2.33 md=2 dev.=0.49
3.5)	Homework assignments		n=11 av.=2.36 md=2 dev.=0.5 ab.=1

## 3.6) Graded materials, examinations




n=11  
 av.=2.18  
 md=2  
 dev.=0.4  
 ab.=1

## 3.7) Lecture presentations



n=10  
 av.=2.3  
 md=2  
 dev.=0.48  
 ab.=2

## 3.8) Class discussions




n=12  
 av.=2.42  
 md=2  
 dev.=0.51

# Profile


Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **C. SURRO**  
 Name of the course: **16F: ECON 2 DIS 1F: PRIN OF ECONOMICS**  
 (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:

- 4.1) Please identify what you perceive to be the real strengths and weaknesses of this teaching assistant and course.
- Chris was a very friendly and approachable teaching assistant. The discussion section was well-organized and clear. I thought it was very nice how he would go out of his way to type and send out discussion section notes.
  - Good TA that provided out of class resources to master material. However, went too far at times in presenting unneeded material for exams.
  - Helpful and could answer questions sometimes
  - Helpful to have a summary of the discussion we had that week at the end of the week. Pretty good outlining of concepts needed for exams which really helped out.




## C. SURRO Evaluation of Instruction Program Report

16F: ECON 2 DIS 1E: PRIN OF ECONOMICS  
 No. of responses = 13  
 Enrollment = 29  
 Response Rate = 44.83%

### 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	0 0 0 0 1 0 1 2 9	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.38 md=9 dev.=1.19
2.2)	Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 8	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.38 md=9 dev.=0.96
2.3)	Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 8	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.54 md=9 dev.=0.66
2.4)	Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 4 7	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.38 md=9 dev.=0.77
2.5)	Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 8	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.46 md=9 dev.=0.78
2.6)	Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 8	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.54 md=9 dev.=0.66
2.7)	Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 9	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.54 md=9 dev.=0.78
2.8)	Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10	Very High or Always	n=13 av.=8.69 md=9 dev.=0.63

3. Your View of Section Characteristics:


3.1)	Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low	2 11 0	High	n=13 av.=1.85 md=2 dev.=0.38
3.2)	Workload/pace was	Too Slow	1 11 0	Too Much	n=12 av.=1.92 md=2 dev.=0.29
3.3)	Integration of section with course was	Poor	0 7 5	Excellent	n=12 av.=2.42 md=2 dev.=0.51
3.4)	Texts, required readings	Poor	0 8 3	Excellent	n=11 av.=2.27 md=2 dev.=0.47 ab.=1
3.5)	Homework assignments	Poor	0 6 6	Excellent	n=12 av.=2.5 md=2.5 dev.=0.52

## 3.6) Graded materials, examinations




n=12  
 av.=2.33  
 md=2  
 dev.=0.49

## 3.7) Lecture presentations



n=11  
 av.=2.55  
 md=3  
 dev.=0.52  
 ab.=1

## 3.8) Class discussions



n=12  
 av.=2.5  
 md=2.5  
 dev.=0.52



# Profile

Subunit: **ECON**  
 Name of the instructor: **C. SURRO**  
 Name of the course: **16F: ECON 2 DIS 1E: PRIN OF ECONOMICS**  
 (Name of the survey)

Values used in the profile line: Mean

## 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=13	av.=8.38
2.2) Teaching Assistant Concern – The T.A. was concerned about student learning.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.38
2.3) Organization – Section presentations were well prepared and organized.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.54
2.4) Scope – The teaching assistant expanded on course ideas.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.38
2.5) Interaction – Students felt welcome in seeking help in or outside of the class.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.46
2.6) Communication Skills – The teaching assistant had good communication skills.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.54
2.7) Value – The overall value of the sections justified your time and effort.	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.54
2.8) Overall – What is your overall rating of the teaching assistant?	Very Low or Never		Very High or Always	n=13	av.=8.69

## 3. Your View of Section Characteristics:

3.1) Difficulty (relative to other courses)	Low		High	n=13	av.=1.85
3.2) Workload/pace was	Too Slow		Too Much	n=12	av.=1.92
3.3) Integration of section with course was	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.42
3.4) Texts, required readings	Poor		Excellent	n=11	av.=2.27
3.5) Homework assignments	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.50
3.6) Graded materials, examinations	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.33
3.7) Lecture presentations	Poor		Excellent	n=11	av.=2.55
3.8) Class discussions	Poor		Excellent	n=12	av.=2.50

## 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.
- Chris Surro is incredibly knowledgeable. It is apparent he has mastered the course material, and is able to teach it with ease. Also, he occasionally adds in some humorous examples as he teaches, which makes learning the material fun, rather than just something that must be done.
  - Chris did a great job on summarizing each chapter's main points and providing some extra econ knowledge. The pace gets a little too fast sometimes but overall he's a helpful TA.
  - Chris's discussion is super helpful for me. He made a lot of confusing concepts very clear and are very patient in answering questions! Thank you!
  - TA is responsible and helpful.
  - This teaching assistant was always very helpful and clear during discussion. He also would take the time to answer any questions I had so I never felt lost.