

ECON 200 AG
 Introduction To Microeconomics
 Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
 Evaluation Form: F
 Responses: 22/38 (58% 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
4.8	5.1
(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:	22	73%	23%	5%				4.8	5.1
The content of the quiz section was:	22	68%	23%	9%				4.8	5.1
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	22	82%	14%	5%				4.9	5.1
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	22	77%	14%	5%	5%			4.9	5.1

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)		Average (4)		Much Lower (1)		Median
		(6)	(5)	(3)	(2)			
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	22	18%	14%	9%	36%	14%	5%	4.2
The intellectual challenge presented was:	22	18%	27%	27%	9%	9%	9%	5.3
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	22	14%	18%	23%	32%	5%	5%	4.7
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	21	24%	14%	24%	33%	5%		5.0
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	22	23%	23%	9%	27%	5%	5%	5.0

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: 5.8 (N=21)

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

Class median: 4.3 (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
10%	14%	24%	14%	10%	14%					5%	5%
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
14%	24%	29%	10%		10%		5%			5%	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
10%	38%	14%	10%	19%						5%		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
19%	10%		14%	48%	10%

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:	22	73%	14%	9%	5%			4.8	3
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	22	68%	18%	14%				4.8	9
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	22	73%	14%	14%				4.8	8
QSI's enthusiasm was:	22	68%	18%	14%				4.8	18
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	22	82%	18%					4.9	10
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	22	77%	9%	14%				4.9	15
Answers to student questions were:	22	68%	18%	14%				4.8	12
Interest level of quiz sections was:	22	55%	32%	14%				4.6	11
QSI's openness to student views was:	22	73%	14%	14%				4.8	17
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	21	67%	19%	14%				4.8	14
Availability of extra help when needed was:	22	68%	18%	14%				4.8	16
Use of quiz section time was:	22	68%	23%	5%	5%			4.8	7
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	22	73%	14%	9%	5%			4.8	13
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	22	68%	23%	5%	5%			4.8	4
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	22	77%	14%	9%				4.9	1
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	22	68%	18%	9%	5%			4.8	6
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	22	77%	9%	9%	5%			4.9	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	22	77%	9%	9%	5%			4.9	5

INSTRUCTOR ADDED ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median
My instructor's quality of explanations of the course content was:	22	59%	18%	14%	5%	5%		4.7
	N	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Median	
I would take another class from this instructor in the future.	21	57%	19%	19%	5%			4.6

ECON 200 AG
 Introduction To Microeconomics
 Course type: Face-to-Face

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
 Evaluation Form: F
 Responses: 22/38 (58% high)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. It gives a new perspective when I am viewing the business and understanding the market more, like why the companies are setting particular price.
2. This class was intellectually stimulating. It stretched my thinking a decent amount especially when it came to the relevance of some of these topics.
3. yes, i have never had to think about economics before and it was challenging to switch to that mindset
4. somewhat
5. Yes it did! The questions we went over during quiz section were so helpful!
6. Yes! Yael would ramble and not teach us but Tyson would come in, calm and collected, teach the information we never heard or got too due to Yael's rambling teach it and turn it into a real world situation and then give us practice.
7. yes
8. Definitely! It was a great intro course
9. Yes he did a great job of making it interesting
10. No, too intro level for me. I am a graduate student who has worked in industry for a couple of years.
11. no

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I attended almost all of the quiz sections and also did all of the homework and writing assignments.
2. I think that Tyson's extensive knowledge about the topics really helped me grasp the ideas. During the lecture I wouldn't understand what was being taught but when I went to the quiz section, Tyson helped break it down and make the material more approachable.
3. TA explanations were more helpful than going to the actual lecture with the professor
4. Instructor going over questions and how to solve them in quiz section
5. The problems that we did in section
6. Tyson's calm approachable demeanor and allowing us to ask questions.
7. peer discussion
8. TA explanations and my personal note taking
9. Visuals
10. Problem sets
11. no

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The fact that the homeworks give answer keys after completing it.
2. There are not any aspects of the class that distracted me from my learning.
3. i wasnt a fan of the professors lecturing style, had to try hard not to fall asleep.
4. n/a
5. None
6. Lectures
7. nothibg
8. It's an 8:30 (but that can't be helped) and it moved a little fast but I managed to keep up :)
9. Not much
10. All of the graphs
11. no

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Make sure that the professor (not TA) know how to efficiently and effectively use the Canvas since the first weeks are unusual.

2. I think Tyson is an amazing TA and truly cared about his students and their ability to understand the concepts. I can tell that Tyson is passionate about these subjects which really helped me as a student who is fairly new to them. The only suggestion I have is integrating more student participation during the quiz sections. I would find myself getting distracted at times but that could have also just been a me issue. Thank you for making ECON 211 do-able.

3. more TAs like this one. my friend started coming to my section because their TA wasn't as helpful as mine

4. having more assigned practice work

5. None

6. New lecturer ! Tyson for the win

7. nothing

8. N/a

9. More practice problems

10. None

11. no

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.