COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 201 I
Introduction To Macroeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Predoc TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: B
Responses: 22/44 (50% high)

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.0	**3.9**
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 4.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	22	36%	23%	36%	5%			3.9	3.8
The course content was:	21	33%	24%	38%	5%			3.8	3.7
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	21	43%	29%	19%	5%	5%		4.2	4.2
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	21	38%	24%	29%	5%	5%		4.0	3.9

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	22	23%	32%	14%	32%				5.6
The intellectual challenge presented was:	21	10%	29%	29%	29%	5%			5.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	21	24%	38%	5%	24%	5%	5%		5.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	21	24%	33%	14%	29%				5.7
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	21	29%	33%	10%	24%	5%			5.9

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=21)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
5%		43%	10%	19%	10%	10%	5%				

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?

Class median: 5.8 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=21)

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
5%	10%	33%	14%	14%	19%			5%			

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=21)

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
5%	62%	29%		5%										

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=21)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
38%	10%	33%		19%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	22	50%	14%	32%	5%			4.5	1
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	21	43%	29%	24%	5%			4.2	5
Explanations by instructor were:	21	43%	14%	29%	5%	10%		4.0	12
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	21	33%	14%	24%	14%	14%		3.4	17
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	21	33%	33%	19%	10%	5%		4.0	14
Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:	21	38%	19%	24%	19%			3.9	11
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	21	33%	24%	24%	10%	10%		3.8	18
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	21	33%	29%	29%	10%			3.9	16
Clarity of course objectives was:	21	43%	24%	14%	14%	5%		4.2	6
Interest level of class sessions was:	21	38%	10%	33%	14%	5%		3.4	15
Availability of extra help when needed was:	21	43%	19%	29%	10%			4.1	13
Use of class time was:	21	38%	29%	19%	10%	5%		4.1	9
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	21	48%	24%	24%	5%			4.4	8
Amount you learned in the course was:	20	40%	35%	25%				4.2	7
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	21	38%	38%	19%	5%			4.2	10
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	21	52%	33%	5%	10%			4.5	2
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	21	52%	33%	10%	5%			4.5	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	21	52%	24%	14%	10%			4.5	4

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2017

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 201 I	Evaluation Delivery: Online
Introduction To Macroeconomics	Evaluation Form: B
Course type: Face-to-Face	Responses: 22/44 (50% high)

Taught by: Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Predoc TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?

1. No, I almost learn this course by myself by reading the textbook. The instructor even can not express a simple content well.

2. Yes. There are lots of information during the lecture and homework.

4. It was stimulating to me.

5. Yes it did, I had to do a lot of research on my own...

6. It is intellectually stimulating, because there are tons of concepts and knowledge that need to be memorized and comprehended, for me, remembering text-linked knowledge is a great challenge.

8. it is exciting

9. Yes it was properly challenging.

10. it was challenging

12. Yes I found that the organization of the course lectures was very good. Macro expanded on micro principles, but I think this content was easier to understand as it applied to the economy as a whole.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Not at all.

2. The knowledge are new for me. the instructor explain them good.

4. Practice problems given out in class.

5. The one on one meeting with the professor ....

6. The worksheet and practice problem are very useful when reviewing for tests.

7. Homework

8. After class material and articles

9. The lectures.

10. powerpoint and drawing, professor did well for first time teaching the class overall, was obviously knowledgable

11. All the graphs were pretty cool, and the textbook wasn't entirely awful

12. When we did practice problems in class. These were super helpful.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The instructor's pronunciation and organization.

2. Some of the knowledge are hard to understand. Homework are not very useful for the exam

3. The professor often seemed flustered and unsure of material, especially when students asked clarifying questions. The biggest problem was that the he didn't seem to have gone over the practice problems before working on them in class, because there was often typos or mistakes in the questions.

4. Inability of other students to grasp basic math.

5. No team work among my peers...

6. None

8. Grammar and teaching speed

9. nothing.

10. the professor could be pretty confusing and when another student or myself asked question he would often react like it was a dumb thing to ask, I eventually felt uncomfortable asking questions

11. Lectures felt super dense, and there wasn't much in the way of breaks to alleviate that

12. Some of the explanations by the professor didn't always seem to make sense.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Organize the course better so that people know which part is important and which part is not that important.

2. Give more examples and practice problem.

3. More preparation for practice problems. Also graded quizzes to prepare for the exams.

4. Make participation worth credit so it isn't just one person contributing the whole time.

5. Work and discuss problems in small groups...

6. I wonder if the department could release some practice problems for the use of study like math department.

7. When a student asks a question, the instructor should refrain from acting as if answering the question would confuse the student. Almost every time a question was asked, the instructor would hesitate multiple times because he appeared to be debating if the explanation was "too complicated" for the student to understand. Provide an explanation for the sake of learning and then clarify what the course expectations are, if the explanation was outside the scope of the course.

8. Learn more from other teacher

9. Maybe use more practice problems spaced throughout the lectures

10. treat all questions like they are good questions, try to be more straightforward, maybe explain things so that they seem over explained because sometimes it felt like the professor was thinking something that he wasn't saying because he doesn't realize that we don't know it because he doesn't even need to think about it since he has done this so much

11. Switch the final time at the beginning of the quarter instead of waiting

12. I don't know, but I would recommend allotting the same amount of time for practice problems. Also post the solutions for these problems sooner. This would help with studying for the exam.

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. *IASystem* reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.[1] In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4).*

Comparative ratings. *IASystem* provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, *IASystem* reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several *IASystem* items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. *IASystem* calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

---

[1] For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.