Teaching Evaluation Summary

Jordi Martinez-Munoz · Summary of student evaluations. This document provides a compact overview of the underlying evaluation reports.

1. Instructor of Record — ECON 100B, Summer Session I 2024

19 evaluations / 29 enrolled (65.5% response rate). Positive = Agree or Strongly Agree. Percentages below use the 19 submitted evaluations as the denominator; blank/no-response items are noted separately where applicable.

Evaluation item	Positive
Class sessions helped me understand the course content.	94.7%
Assignments (reading, homework, projects, etc.) helped me understand the course content.	94.7%
Exams and other assessments were a fair measure of course learning outcomes.	94.7%
I received timely and helpful feedback in this course.	94.7%
The course developed my understanding and skills for the subject.	94.7%
The course was intellectually stimulating and engaging.	84.2%
The instructor effectively communicated course goals, learning outcomes, and expectations.	100%
There were sufficient opportunities for me to get help when needed.	94.7%
The instructor incorporated teaching methods that helped me learn.	84.2%
The instructor arrived on time to class sessions and office hours.	94.7%
The instructor created a welcoming and supportive learning environment that valued and supported equity, diversity, and inclusion.	100%
The instructor explained what constituted cheating in this course and emphasized the importance of academic integrity.	100%
The instructor effectively related the course material to real-world applications or situations outside of the classroom.	94.7%
The instructor maintained a balance between theoretical concepts and practical applications throughout the course.	89.5%
The instructor encouraged student participation in lectures or course activities.	94.7%
I would consider taking another class with this instructor.	94.7%

Other items in the original report are open-ended/context questions (e.g., reasons for taking the course, attendance, workload, expected grade) and are not included here as teaching-quality measures.

2. Instructional Assistant Evaluations — 2024–2026

173 evaluations across seven evaluation reports. The standardized IA instrument uses the same three headline dimensions: learning/engagement, communication, and supportive learning environment. Positive = Agree or Strongly Agree; percentages are calculated from submitted evaluations for each report, including any No Opinion/Not Applicable responses in the denominator.

Course / term	Evaluations	Response rate	Learning / engagement	Communication	Supportive environment
GPCO 401 — Fall 2024	70	36.1%	92.9%	94.3%	95.7%
GPCO 401 — Fall 2025	28	21.4%	96.4%	96.4%	96.4%
ECON 100A — Winter 2025	55	11.9%	94.5%	92.7%	92.7%
ECON 100A — Winter 2026	6	2.1%	100%	100%	100%
ECON 142 — Spring 2025, Section 1	3	27.3%	100%	100%	100%
ECON 142 — Spring 2025, Section 2	3	23.1%	66.7%	100%	100%
ECON 100B — Spring 2026	8	3.4%	100%	100%	100%
ALL 2024–26 IA	173	13.0%	94.2%	94.8%	95.4%

Note on the pooled row: The aggregate percentages are pooled respondent-level shares, not averages of course percentages. The course-level response rates are shown separately because enrollment and response rates vary substantially across courses.

3. Instructional Assistant Evaluations — Prior to 2024

Earlier IA evaluations used a different instrument. To avoid mixing instruments, the comparable summary measure reported here is the share selecting Agree or Strongly Agree to “I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.”

Course / term	Evaluations	Response rate	Would recommend this IA
GPCO 401 — Fall 2023	56	34.6%	91.1%
GPCO 401 — Fall 2022	50	29.6%	100%
GPCO 401 — Fall 2021	21	10.6%	90.5%
ECON 120C — Summer 2022	9	15.3%	100%
ECON 100B — Spring 2022	4	1.4%	100%
ECON 100B — Winter 2022	17	6.6%	100%
MGT 410 — Special Session 2023	8	19.0%	0%
MGT 444 — Spring 2023	8	57.1%	100%
MGT 160 — Winter 2023 (2 sections)	12	6.2%	83.3%

MGT 410 context: This course did not include TA-led discussion sections, and my TA responsibilities consisted primarily of grading and office hours. The evaluation comments indicate that some students expected greater interaction with the TA and noted the absence of lecture attendance. The course did not require TA attendance at lectures, and grading followed the course instructor’s expectations.

The full evaluation reports contain the underlying response distributions and comments. Find the full evaluation below.