

ECON 201 AD  
Introduction To Macroeconomics  
Course type: Face-to-Face  
Taught by: Dmitry Brizhatyuk  
**Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-TA**

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F  
Responses: 32/54 (59% 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
<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.3</b>
(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:

<b>CEI: 5.2</b>
(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 quiz section as a whole was:	32	44%	34%	16%		6%		4.3	4.3
The content of the quiz section was:	32	44%	44%	6%	3%	3%		4.4	4.3
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	32	50%	34%	12%	3%			4.5	4.4
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	32	38%	34%	25%			3%	4.1	4.1

### STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
<b>Relative to other college courses you have taken:</b>									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	32	25%	31%	25%	16%	3%			5.7
The intellectual challenge presented was:	32	28%	25%	34%	9%	3%			5.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	32	28%	19%	44%	9%				5.4
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	32	31%	34%	28%	6%				6.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	32	38%	25%	25%	12%				6.0

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: 6.2 (N=32)**

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
	16%	25%	25%	9%	9%	3%	6%	3%			3%

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

**Class median: 4.8 (N=32)**

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
	3%	16%	47%	6%	19%	3%		3%			3%

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=30)**

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
27%	57%	3%	3%	10%										

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

**(N=32)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
50%	16%	3%		28%	3%

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	32	41%	22%	31%		3%	3%	4.1	9
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	32	53%	19%	22%	3%	3%		4.6	4
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	32	38%	28%	31%		3%		4.1	11
QSI's enthusiasm was:	32	38%	34%	25%	3%			4.1	13
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	32	28%	34%	34%		3%		3.9	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	32	31%	25%	34%	6%	3%		3.8	15
Answers to student questions were:	32	28%	25%	44%		3%		3.6	16
Interest level of quiz sections was:	32	28%	31%	31%	6%		3%	3.8	10
QSI's openness to student views was:	32	38%	25%	28%	9%			4.0	14
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	32	28%	22%	31%	16%	3%		3.5	17
Availability of extra help when needed was:	32	34%	34%	28%	3%			4.0	12
Use of quiz section time was:	32	47%	22%	25%	6%			4.4	6
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	32	44%	31%	22%	3%			4.3	8
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	32	44%	31%	22%			3%	4.3	7
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	32	56%	22%	16%	3%		3%	4.6	3
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	32	56%	28%	16%				4.6	1
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	32	56%	22%	16%	6%			4.6	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	32	50%	22%	25%	3%			4.5	5

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

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F  
Responses: 32/54 (59% high)

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes. Provided content that required elevated thinking.
2. Yes the class was, I enjoyed learning about the inner workings of the economy on a macro level
4. It stretched my thinking because I was required to apply the knowledge I had gained.
5. I do not enjoy economics so I was very bored
6. Yes, this class was very difficult and intellectually stimulating.
7. Yes
8. yes, the quiz sections were interesting and used relevant practical examples
9. There were practice problems each week that stretch my thinking because I had to apply what I learned to different scenarios.
10. Yes it helped bring lecture work into test like problems
11. Yes
12. He helped me the most, when my professor couldn't
13. Yes this TA does really well
14. It was a great class! I thoroughly enjoyed it and I think Dmitry did an amazing job at teaching the quiz section!
15. yes
16. Yes it did it taught me more about the U.S. Economy
17. Yes
18. Yes, We learned about the economy in different way from last quarter

### What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Diagrams and graphs.
2. The quiz section itself was a very helpful review of the material that was presented in the week. The packets of key topics passed out every class were especially useful.
3. Instructor provided extra practice problems which was very helpful.
4. Quiz sections! Practice problems were prime.
5. Worksheets in quiz section
6. Dmitriy did a great job going over practice problems and teaching us how to do different types of work that were not explained well enough in class. He was a wonderful TA.
7. None
8. ta notes
9. Having the Quiz Section Instructor explain how to do the problem was very helpful because I was able to see the required steps in solving a problem. Also, the TA notes were very useful because it was able to summarize the weeks lecture and I was able to use the notes to better understand the content and to review the content.
10. The helpful examples on the board
11. More practical contribution
12. Him teaching me concepts in quiz
13. the practice problems does
15. TA was encouraging and very patient
16. The tests
17. Visualizing graphs on board
18. The handouts that we received every week. They were very helpful because they outlined what we had learned during the week and then had some practice problems to help us understand further.

### What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. n/a

2. I think that the teacher shouldn't have ended early (by only about 5 minutes once or twice) when we could've done one more practice problem.
4. None
5. Early morning
6. Nothing.
7. None
8. none
9. Some explanations of the content was hard to understand.
10. the amount of people in the section
11. Too many people
12. too many kids in my quiz section
13. nothing does detracted me from my learning
15. sometimes hard to understand explanations
16. Sometimes we started late for class, but nothing really
17. None
18. None, I thought Dimitry was a very good TA

**What suggestions do you have for improving the class?**

1. Answer more confidently to student questions
2. The class room we were put in was in a very obscure building and the room's equipment was outdated.
4. N/A
5. No launchpd
6. I don't have any recommendations. Dmitriy does a great job teaching this class and is one of the best TA's I've had at UW.
7. None
8. none
10. Smaller class sizes
11. More practices
12. smaller quiz sections
13. I think we should take more time to talk about the article responses
15. nothing
16. Being more organized
17. None
18. None

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> 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.