### STUDENTS' RATINGS ON TEACHER

**Faculty Member:** YANG WANYU  
**Department:** ECONOMICS  
**Faculty:** ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES  
**Module:** MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS II - EC3101  
**Activity Type:** TUTORIAL  

Class Size/Response Size/Response Rate : 59 / 41 / 69.49%
Contact Session/Teaching Hour : 30 / 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qn</th>
<th>Items Evaluated</th>
<th>Fac. Member Avg Score</th>
<th>Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev</th>
<th>Dept Avg Score (a)</th>
<th>Fac. Avg Score (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.</td>
<td>4.122</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>4.131</td>
<td>4.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>(4.153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.</td>
<td>3.976</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>3.996</td>
<td>4.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.908</td>
<td>(4.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.</td>
<td>4.220</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>4.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.093</td>
<td>(4.168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Q1 to Q3</td>
<td>4.106</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>NA (NA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computed Overall Effectiveness of the Teacher.</td>
<td>4.157</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>4.157</td>
<td>4.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>(4.182)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. A 5-point scale is used for the scores. The higher the score, the better the rating.
2. **Fac. Member Avg Score:** The mean of all the scores for each question for the faculty member.
3. **Fac. Member Avg Score Std. Dev:** A measure of the range of variability. It measures the extent to which a faculty member's Average Score differs from all the scores in the faculty member's evaluation. The smaller the standard deviation, the greater the robustness of the number given as average.
4. **Dept Avg Score:**
   (a) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial) within the department.
   (b) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level (level 3000) within the department.
5. **Fac. Avg Score:**
   (c) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial) within the faculty.
   (d) the mean score of same activity type (Tutorial), at the same module level (level 3000) within the faculty.

---

https://myaces.nus.edu.sg/nce/1516/adminproca1516  
1/12/2016
### FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES ON TEACHER

Faculty Member:  YANG WANYU  
Department:  ECONOMICS  
Faculty:  ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES  
Module:  MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS II - EC3101  
Academic Year:  2015/2016  
Semester:  1

**Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 1: The teacher has enhanced my thinking ability.)**

![Graph showing frequency distribution of responses](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS\SCORE</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>12 (29.27%)</td>
<td>25 (60.98%)</td>
<td>2 (4.88%)</td>
<td>1 (2.44%)</td>
<td>1 (2.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department</td>
<td>417 (31.74%)</td>
<td>632 (48.10%)</td>
<td>206 (15.68%)</td>
<td>37 (2.82%)</td>
<td>22 (1.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Faculty</td>
<td>1786 (34.03%)</td>
<td>2654 (50.56%)</td>
<td>677 (12.90%)</td>
<td>92 (1.75%)</td>
<td>40 (.76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 2: The teacher has increased my interest in the subject.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Nos. of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM\SCORE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>9 (21.95%)</td>
<td>27 (65.85%)</td>
<td>1 (2.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department</td>
<td>352 (26.79%)</td>
<td>593 (45.13%)</td>
<td>293 (22.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Faculty</td>
<td>1647 (31.41%)</td>
<td>2494 (47.56%)</td>
<td>908 (17.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency Distribution of responses (Qn 3: The teacher provided timely and useful feedback.)

![Frequency Distribution Chart](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM SCORE</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>16 (39.02%)</td>
<td>22 (53.66%)</td>
<td>0 (.00%)</td>
<td>2 (4.88%)</td>
<td>1 (2.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Tutorial), at the same level within Department</td>
<td>416 (31.78%)</td>
<td>657 (50.19%)</td>
<td>195 (14.90%)</td>
<td>24 (1.83%)</td>
<td>17 (1.30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teaching all Modules of the Same Activity Type (Lecture), at the same level within Department</td>
<td>1818 (34.79%)</td>
<td>2636 (50.45%)</td>
<td>643 (12.31%)</td>
<td>86 (1.65%)</td>
<td>42 (0.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENTS' COMMENTS ON TEACHER

Faculty Member: YANG WANYU
Department: ECONOMICS
Faculty: ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
Module: MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS II - EC3101
Activity Type: TUTORIAL
Academic Year: 2015/2016
Semester: 1

What are the teacher's strengths? (27 comments)

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. Good review before class clear explanations
2. She explains the concept very clearly. She recaps the lecture materials at the start of every lesson which is beneficial for me.
3. She is very logical and clear when going through some of the tougher questions in tutorial, always making sure that students are convinced and understand the concepts before moving on. Very dedicated and responsible.
4. Very good summaries at the start of each class
5. Very helpful, preparing extra materials to help studnets better understand concepts Very diligent in her work, chasing students for updating of attendance
6. summary of each week's lecture before the start of the tutorial is very useful, miss yang is also very clear in her explanations on more difficult questions and concepts. she is also a responsible tutor who follows up with us consistently.

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. - Conducts the tutorial efficiently - Provides overview of individual topics at the start of each tutorial
2. Clear explanation
3. Could explain concepts well, and provided useful summaries.
4. Gave review/summary of the lecture at the start of the tutorial
5. Knowledgeable on the subject
6. Provide lecture summary at the start of tutorial
7. Provide very clear summary of lecture contents, explain every tutorial questions very clearly, also gives us extra practice question to try out in class.
8. She goes through each question with much rigor.
9. She helps to consolidate the important points of each Chapter in each of her tutorial class.
10. She provides mindmaps and summaries to facilitate learning.
11. She reviews what was taught in the lecture at the start of every tutorial. She will answer all of our queries right after each lesson.
12. She will always give an overview of the concepts that were gone through during the lecture before having to continue with the tutorial questions.
13. Very clear explanation
14. Very clear explanations and always give summary of lecture content at the start of tutorials

15. Very good and clear-cut explanation of tutorial question. Also provide a summary of topic each lesson which is very useful to students.

16. did summary to start each tutorial, very clear summary

17. timely replies for email. good revision at the start of each tutorial. knows her stuff well.

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. Very thorough with lecture reviews and explanations

Comments from students who gave an average score less than 3.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. -NIL-
2. She ensures she goes through the weeks content first before class. When we present, she makes sure we explain it properly.
3. Well prepared.

What improvements would you suggest to the teacher? (24 comments)

Comments from students who gave an average score less than 3.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. Please study more about the topic before teaching
2. Smile more :)

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 3.5 and less than 4.0 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. More clarity in communication

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.0 and less than 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher
1. -
2. Be more expressive
3. Can speed up a little so that we are able to finish all questions in class
4. Good enough (:)
5. NA
6. NIL
7. NIL.
8. None
9. Nope
10. She could end classes earlier.
11. She could probably be more friendly and smile more in class.
12. She could try to improve on explaining the concepts in relation to the questions. Though I understand the concepts, sometimes it may be hard to see the link between the concept in the question.

13. Should allocate the time well. At times, she didn't manage to finish going through the tutorials in class.

14. She is good

15. Smile, you look quite fierce haha =)

Comments from students who gave an average score greater than or equal to 4.5 for the computed overall effectiveness of the teacher

1. -

2. -


4. None

5. Other than a few mispronunciation of certain English words, she is doing a great job as a TA.

6. nil
STUDENTS’ NOMINATIONS FOR BEST TEACHING

Faculty Member: YANG WANYU
Department: ECONOMICS
Faculty: ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
Academic Year: 2015/2016
Semester: 1
Module Code: EC3101
No of Nominations: 4

1. She provide summary of lecture contents, explain tutorial questions very clearly, go the extra mile to give us extra questions to answer.