COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2025

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

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

Taught by: Tyson Ramirez
Instructor Evaluated: Tyson Ramirez-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery:	Online
Evaluation Form:	F
Responses:	35/42 (83% very 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
4.6	**4.8**
(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: 4.6
(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:	35	57%	29%	14%				4.6	4.9
The content of the quiz section was:	35	51%	34%	11%	3%			4.5	4.7
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	35	60%	26%	14%				4.7	4.9
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	35	57%	29%	9%	6%			4.6	4.8

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:	35	3%	23%	23%	37%	9%	3%	3%	4.5
The intellectual challenge presented was:	35	9%	29%	34%	20%	9%			5.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	35	14%	23%	26%	34%	3%			5.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	35	14%	34%	23%	29%				5.4
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	35	9%	37%	26%	23%	6%			5.3

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: 6.5   (N=35)**

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
6%	17%	20%	14%	23%	14%	3%					3%

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 4.9   (N=35)**

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
11%	17%	31%	17%	17%		3%					3%

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.5   (N=35)**

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
11%	46%	20%	14%	6%		3%								

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=35)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
49%	14%	6%		29%	3%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2025

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:	35	49%	29%	17%	3%	3%		4.5	12
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	35	51%	40%	6%	3%			4.5	11
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	35	46%	40%	14%				4.4	17
QSI's enthusiasm was:	35	60%	34%	6%				4.7	14
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	35	54%	31%	14%				4.6	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	35	54%	29%	14%	3%			4.6	16
Answers to student questions were:	35	51%	31%	11%	6%			4.5	15
Interest level of quiz sections was:	35	46%	34%	14%	6%			4.4	7
QSI's openness to student views was:	35	63%	31%	6%				4.7	6
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	35	57%	31%	11%				4.6	5
Availability of extra help when needed was:	35	60%	26%	14%				4.7	4
Use of quiz section time was:	35	63%	26%	11%				4.7	2
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	35	57%	37%	6%				4.6	10
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	35	49%	29%	20%	3%			4.5	9
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	35	54%	31%	14%				4.6	8
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	35	49%	34%	17%				4.5	13
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	35	69%	23%	9%				4.8	1
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	35	69%	20%	9%	3%			4.8	3

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2025

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

Taught by: Tyson Ramirez
Instructor Evaluated: Tyson Ramirez-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 35/42 (83% very high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. yes it helped further the professors lecture and clarify some parts of confusion

2. Not really simply because of the content

3. Absolutely the TA really made me absolutely maximize my intellectual capabilities

4. Yes because a lot of it was conceptual understanding with graphs

6. yes, the topics were challenging enough to require me to think critically

7. This class is good overall, it teaches me lots of staff related to the real world economy, which stretches my thinking.

8. yes it did because it's conceptual but also calculating stuff

9. Tyson did a great job of intellectually stimulating the class and I thought he did an excellent job of making the class fun.

10. Tyson was a fantastic teacher who is clearly passionate about the subject and was eager to help every student in his class.

11. Yes. It is a class outside of my major and introduced me to new ideas.

12. The TA section provided a lot of helpful review of the material presented in class. I was able to apply the content presented in class to problems in the quiz section.

13. Yes it was interesting with some good analysis on the questions and helpful comments from Tyson.

14. This class did stretch my thinking because it is such a broad subject and I learn best when I am in a subject that easily builds onto itself, not something that covers so many different facets of life.

15. This class was extremely intellectually stimulating. Tyson was able pack every class not only with the information that was expected of him to teach, but also was able to make new connections and help frame the material in an interesting, practical, and digestible manner. Every class forced me to make new connections and actually work to understand the material, despite me struggling in the course. Tyson's class always made things come together.

16. Yes interesting subject matter best TA ever

17. Yes it helped me learn more about the economy and how to do so in regards to math.

18. Yes, because it was new content for me, so it was basically me learning things from scratch.

19. This class was intellectually stimulating because it integrated mathematical concepts into real-world situations to help us analyze them.

20. Very, because applying some logic and principles in reality requires a certain level of understanding.

21. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating and takes time and effort to grasp concepts.

22. Yes

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. qsi explaining the key concepts taught in lecture thats gonna be used for the problem we're solving in a more summarized way

2. The practice problems

3. Probably going through all of the work with the TA because they were able to make concepts easier to understand

4. Effort and grinding for something I didn't understand

6. i learned a lot of new things and tyson was great in simplifying and helping me understand

7. The teaching and expression of the knowledge

8. honestly probably the quiz sections bc it's smaller and like they actually go over practice problems which is hard to do in lecture when ur tryna learn the content too

9. Tyson's enthusiasm for teaching Economics.

10. He was careful to answer questions accurately and help students any way he can.

11. The questions we worked through within quiz sections.

12. The TA was very helpful in going over the problems step by step. He responded to emails very fast and was helpful during office hours.

13. Going through every problem step by step and showing all the work and notes on the whiteboard

14. The quiz section and the practice problems done in them has been the most helpful to make me understand what we're learning.

15. Tyson's lectures and problem explanations were very helpful in contributing to my learning. He has a great strength in making concepts that feel very 'out there' or theoretically make sense to me and my world. I would oftentimes come into class confused and uncertain from lecture, but the material that Tyson covered always cam. together and made sense because his unique ability to explain concepts and problems in multiple different ways.

16. Quiz section

17. Going over problems and reviewing lecture concepts.

18. The homework - quizzes and chapter hw

19. Problem solving in quiz sections, lecture-style quiz sections used toward end of quarter

20. Some examples of applying economic concepts to reality.

21. Textbook

22. Examples were conducive to learning

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. when the room is really hot

2. N/a

3. Nothing

4. The time put in

6. nothing

7. The definition would be hard

8. having to note take rly fast before the slide switched and then not being able to comprehend what ur typing

9. None.

10. Maybe some unenthusiastic students, but that wasn't his fault.

11. None

12. None

13. Probably that we had to do the same type of questions from the same worksheet every week could have mixed it up a little more.

15. The only thing that detracted from my learning was when the textbook questions we used were wrong.

16. Poor lectures from proff

17. Not giving us a chance to solve the problems on our own and just doing them.

18. the super long lecture and the fact that quiz section was only once a week, and the fact that none of the lectures or quiz sections served as a review session for the midterm.

21. I feel that class lectures sometimes seem hard to understand.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. make the room less hot

2. N/a

3. Get more TA like Tyson Ramirez

4. More practice exams available

5. Letting us take worksheets home with us from quiz section and having the questions written out on the worksheet rather than the worksheet referring to a question in the textbook. I think the worksheets could've been a really good study source. For attendance doing a Kahoot or Tophat or sign in sheet could be used instead.

6. none

7. I think can involve more thinking part by students themselves

8. i would just do more practice problems and maybe give more practice exams that r more similar to the actual exam

9. None.

11. Additional practice problems

12. None

13. Some suggestions I have are to maybe ask students to come up with answers themselves first when working on problems and to have more student feedback and engagement along with teaching the material. But overall the quiz section was super helpful and engaging.

14. I think offering practice midterms and finals that do actually represent what the exams will be like is more helpful. The practice exams that were offered were on completely different subjects, so the only practice tests were online quizzes and homeworks and a few practice problems in the textbook, which are helpful for understanding content. But, to actually perform well, I need to simulate the exam environment, so I think having actual practice exams that relate to the content would be very helpful.

15. The biggest thing that would've helped me is having more time in discussion compared to lecture.

16. More practice problems with explained answers

17. Give everyone a chance to do the problems themselves which would help us to learn.

18. having two quiz sections a week, shorter lectures, and including review for exams during those class times.

21. More interactive in some way

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.