

## Student Assessment of Modules Autumn Term 2009

Module code: *EC930*

Module title: *THEORY OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION*

Module supervisor: *Squintani, F.*

The first table provides the mean scores for the individual teaching event identified as *module* (i.e. EC111) and the corresponding scores for the department (mean across events). The second table provides the overall mean score for the event and the department.

Mean scores range from 5.0 to 1.0. The higher/lower the score, the more/less favourable the response.

This report provides mean scores for each assessed module.

The questionnaire statements are printed below.

Students were asked to answer all questions, using a 5 point scale, where 5 is the highest score and 1 the lowest.

**1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Mildly agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree**

The statements were:

- Q1. The overall level of the module was about right, given my background.
- Q2. The formal (mathematical) content was appropriate, in view of the subject.
- Q3. The assigned readings and learning tasks (e.g. exercises) were appropriate.
- Q4. The supporting materials (e.g. in the CMR) were satisfactory.
- Q5. The module was well taught.

**Table 1. Results across questions**

Total Replies (21)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Mean	4.33	4.29	4.19	4.14	4.19
Dept. Mean	4.06	4.04	3.99	4.03	4.11

**Table 2. Overall results**

Module Mean	Dept. Mean
<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.04</b>

## Student Assessment of Modules

### Autumn Term ~~2011~~ <sup>2012-13</sup>

Module code: *EC903*

Module title: *MICROECONOMICS*

Module supervisor: *Squintani, F.*

The first table provides the mean scores for the individual teaching event identified as *module* (i.e. EC111) and the corresponding scores for the department (mean across events). The second table provides the overall mean score for the event and the department.

Mean scores range from 5.0 to 1.0. The higher/lower the score, the more/less favourable the response.

This report provides mean scores for each assessed module.

The questionnaire statements are printed below.

Students were asked to answer all questions, using a 5 point scale, where 5 is the highest score and 1 the lowest.

**1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Mildly agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree**

The statements were:

- Q1. The overall level of the module was about right, given my background.
- Q2. The formal (mathematical) content was appropriate, in view of the subject.
- Q3. The assigned readings and learning tasks (e.g. exercises) were appropriate.
- Q4. The supporting materials (e.g. in the CMR) were satisfactory.
- Q5. The module was well taught.

**Table 1. Results across questions**

Total Replies (60)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Mean	4.13	4.17	4.17	4.05	4.18
Dept. Mean	3.98	4.04	4.00	4.00	4.07

**Table 2. Overall results**

Module Mean	Dept. Mean
<b>4.14</b>	<b>4.02</b>