

# Teaching Evaluations and Course Syllabi

Table 1: Courses Taught as the Instructor of Record

Term	Course	Enrollment	Respondents	% Recommend	Evaluations	Syllabus
Spring 2022	ECON 138	40	34	100%	1	2
Fall 2021	ECON 138	260	69	90%	3	4
Summer 2021	ECON 1	49	30	97%	5	6

Fall 2021: This class was co-taught with two others. Statistics are aggregated from four sections.

Table 2: Courses Taught as a Teaching Assistant

Term	Course	Instructor	Enrollment	Respondents	% Recommend	Evaluations	
						Student	Instructor
Winter 2022	GPCO 404	Cullen	89	9	78%	7	12
Spring 2021	ECON 151	Meckel	49	3	100%	9	10
Winter 2021	GPCO 404	Cullen	68	16	100%	11	12
Fall 2020	ECON 151	Meckel	90	4	100%	13	14
Summer 2020	ECON 138	Bharadwaj	68	4	100%	15	16
Spring 2020	ECON 151	Meckel	53	4	100%	17	18
Winter 2020	ECON 151	Meckel	48	6	83%	19	20
Fall 2019	ECON 131	Jacobsen	245	8	88%	21	22
Spring 2019	ECON 138	Bharadwaj	324	1	N/A	N/A	23
Winter 2019	Econ 100C	Sinitsyn	85	6	83%	24	N/A
Fall 2018	ECON 131	Jacobsen	298	12	92%	25	26

No data provided for Spring 2019 138: Economics of Discrimination because too few evaluations were submitted. Enrollment is listed for entire class; student could attend any TA's discussion section or office hours. Professor Sinitsyn did not write an instructor evaluation in Winter 2019.

# Contents

1	Spring 2022: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Instructor)</i>	4
2	Spring 2022: Course Syllabus <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Instructor)</i>	13
3	Fall 2021: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Co-Instructor)</i>	21
4	Fall 2021: Course Syllabus <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Co-Instructor)</i>	47
5	Summer 2021: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 1 - Principles of Microeconomics (Instructor)</i>	57
6	Summer 2021: Course Syllabus <i>ECON 1 - Principles of Microeconomics (Instructor)</i>	64
7	Winter 2022: Student Evaluations <i>GPCO 404 - Market Failures (TA)</i>	69
8	Winter 2022: Instructor Evaluation <i>GPCO 404 - Market Failures (TA)</i>	74
9	Spring 2021: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	76
10	Spring 2021: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	80
11	Winter 2021: Student Evaluations <i>GPCO 404 - Market Failures (TA)</i>	82
12	Winter 2021: Instructor Evaluation <i>GPCO 404 - Market Failures (TA)</i>	90
13	Fall 2020: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	92
14	Fall 2020: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	96
15	Summer 2020: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (TA)</i>	98
16	Summer 2020: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (TA)</i>	102
17	Spring 2020: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	104
18	Spring 2020: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	108
19	Winter 2020: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	110
20	Winter 2020: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 151 - Public Economics: Expenditures I (TA)</i>	114
21	Fall 2019: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (TA)</i>	116
22	Fall 2019: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (TA)</i>	120
23	Spring 2019: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (TA)</i>	122
24	Winter 2019: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 100C - Microeconomics C (TA)</i>	124

<b>25 Fall 2018: Student Evaluations <i>ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (TA)</i></b>	<b>128</b>
<b>26 Fall 2018: Instructor Evaluation <i>ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (TA)</i></b>	<b>132</b>



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (A)  
Spring Quarter 2022

**Number of Students Enrolled: 40**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 34**

### PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

1 (2.9%):	Freshman
0 (0.0%):	Sophomore
7 (20.6%):	Junior
25 (73.5%):	Senior
1 (2.9%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

24 (70.6%):	Major
3 (8.8%):	Minor
2 (5.9%):	Gen. Ed.
5 (14.7%):	Elective
0 (0.0%):	Interest

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

14 (41.2%):	A
17 (50.0%):	B
2 (5.9%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
1 (2.9%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

2 (5.9%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (5.9%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
18 (52.9%):	Agree
12 (35.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

3 (8.8%):	0-1
12 (35.3%):	2-3
11 (32.4%):	4-5
5 (14.7%):	6-7
0 (0.0%):	8-9
3 (8.8%):	10-11
0 (0.0%):	12-13
0 (0.0%):	14-15
0 (0.0%):	16-17
0 (0.0%):	18-19
0 (0.0%):	20 or more

6. How often do you attend this course?

1 (3.0%):	Very Rarely
6 (18.2%):	Some of the Time
26 (78.8%):	Most of the Time
1:	[No Response]

## **COURSE MATERIAL ECON 138**

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (42.4%):	Agree
19 (57.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (3.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (42.4%):	Agree
18 (54.5%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

9. Required reading is useful.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
10 (30.3%): Agree  
23 (69.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

10. This course is difficult relative to others.

2 (6.1%): Strongly Disagree  
12 (36.4%): Disagree  
14 (42.4%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 (12.1%): Agree  
1 (3.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

11. Exams are representative of the course material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
5 (15.2%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
8 (24.2%): Agree  
9 (27.3%): Strongly Agree  
11 (33.3%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

12. Do you recommend this course overall?

33 (100.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
1: [No Response]

13. Course ECON 138:

- I like the economic approach on subjects that are major social talking points
- You get a new perspective on discrimination, I highly recommend the course.
- Frankly, this course should be required for Econ majors. It is extremely important for people to grapple with these issues.
- I really enjoyed this course and I feel like I learned a lot from all the papers that we read and from all the presentations that Professor Rittenhouse gave in lectures.
- the best econ class for practical and moral application
- This has been a very insightful course that brings forth an economic lens to everyday issues of our society in terms of discrimination and looking at potential explanations on the economic side.
- I enjoyed ECON 138 as it takes topics that we see in the news and apply them to studies that quantitatively support the possibility of discrimination.

- Professor is nice and the slide her provided is so clear. I learned a lot.
- I have really enjoyed this class and am so glad that I took it at UCSD. The readings that are provided are critical and really reveal a lot about the different types of discrimination and how to identify it in controversial conversations and empirical data.
- The course material is very interesting for people in any major and I would consider it to be a great course to take for the DEI requirement.
- Very interesting course, definitely relative to what is going on in todays news and how it impacts us as students.

#### 14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- good
- There will be 3 writing assignment and reflection notes for each week. The final gonna be oral exam.
- Paper are stimulating and rely on information learned in class
- Papers are fairly graded and the TA does a great job with recommending ways to fix what a student previously did wrong.
- The papers reinforced the concepts that we have gone over in class. They even go as far as to push us to think about alternative explanations for discrimination, as each study is not perfect.
- The papers are pretty fair and do a good job of synthesizing the information we have been taught. They are straight forward and require you to think and summarize information, which is good in a class with so many layers.
- Papers worth 50% of grade and attending office hours will help grasp a better understanding of topics as it seems the answers should be precise .
- the papers in class simulate the ability to retain the information taught and allows for a personal flair and interpretation
- The papers were difficult, but definitely promoted learning for me because they exposed my weak points in my understanding of the material.

#### 15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

- Just read assigned reading and class to be in the loop.
- Reading material is diverse and relevant
- Required readings are actually discussed in class so there is no unnecessary time wasted to read articles that will not further your knowledge in the course. These readings are very essential to course understanding.
- The readings are new, relevant, and challenge previously held beliefs. I really like how Professor Rittenhouse approaches the material and leaves the floor open for students with different opinions or thoughts!
- Reading the articles before class was definitely crucial to understanding the material so I thought it was the right approach to have graded participation in class where she called on us to

answer questions about the articles. I think many students, including myself, were used to being quiet behind our Zoom screens during the long remote learning period as a result of the pandemic, so it was smart to give everyone an incentive to speak in class and promote discussions.

- We are assigned reading for each lecture, and we will read it with questions before class.
- The readings are confusing at times but are interesting in that you can learn about the different ways that the researchers conduct their studies.
- There is reading assigned every class but they are doable.
- the readings although academic papers that can be confusing are relatively easy to understand with deeper thought and add sustenance to the course.

## **INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
9 (29.0%): Agree  
22 (71.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
11 (34.4%): Agree  
21 (65.6%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
8 (25.8%): Agree  
23 (74.2%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (34.4%):	Agree
21 (65.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (6.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (45.2%):	Agree
15 (48.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

1 (3.2%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.2%):	Disagree
3 (9.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (35.5%):	Agree
15 (48.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (31.3%):	Agree
21 (65.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 (15.6%):	Agree
26 (81.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (28.1%):	Agree
22 (68.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
2:	[No Response]

25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (29.0%):	Agree
22 (71.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (29.0%):	Agree
22 (71.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (3.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 (16.1%):	Agree
24 (77.4%):	Strongly Agree
1 (3.2%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:

- Great instructor just wish she had a better TA
- Professor Rittenhouse is an excellent professor and clearly teaches the material well. She does a good job of relating economics to the world around us and challenges us to think of the material in a different light. When approaching controversial subjects, Professor Rittenhouse is sensitive and intentional with her language and always clarifies what she is saying, so there is no room for misunderstandings. I have appreciated getting to visit her in office hours and she is very helpful with explaining the material (specifically regression charts) both inside and outside the classroom!
- Professor Rittenhouse was definitely very qualified for her position as our instructor because she

was able to highlight the key economic ideas and translate the complex data in order to thoroughly explain the author's economics reasoning in their arguments.

- Professor Rittenhouse is great at introducing an economic viewpoint to difficult subjects that are major talking points in news and politics. She challenges my approach to these tougher socioeconomic matters
- This course has the potential to be very emotional for certain individuals and professor Rittenhouse did a very good job of holding a neutral position and making everyone feel comfortable. she constantly engaged the class and made sure that the key points were understood overall very good professor
- Professor Rittenhouse does a great job at taking into consideration students' circumstances. When I couldn't make it to class, Professor Rittenhouse responded to email in a timely manner and answered any questions I had with as much detail as possible.
- Rittenhouse is one of the best instructors that I have had in the Economics department. She explains the material extremely well, both explaining the implications of the papers we were reading and discussing their limitations.
- Professor Rittenhouse is an amazing professor who truly cares about the students. She is well prepared and teaches the course wonderfully.
- She is knowledgeable and objective person. Her class is informational and perfect prepared.
- very detailed and explanatory makes learning these tough subjects easier to understand.
- Very professional, wants students to interact and ask questions. Available outside of office hours and very understanding if issues arise when it comes to attending lecture. Stops often to make sure we are following along and understanding the material. Would take class with instructor again. Wants all students to learn and makes the class a friendly safe place to be and appreciates participation even if not quiet what she is looking for.
- Professor Rittenhouse supports all students in that she is easily accessible outside of class and very accommodating to personal emergencies. Her lectures are also engaging in that she asks questions throughout her lectures to facilitate critical thinking and a better understanding of the material.

## 29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

33 (100.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
1: [No Response]

## Custom Question 5

### 30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

- Professor Rittenhouse created an inclusive learning environment by creating space for class discussions, providing good questions, and always asking students to think of policy solutions and the "next step" , which was helpful to those of us who are not used to thinking purely in an economic context.
- I think she did everything perfect

- Made sure that everybody gets a chance to ask questions (even anonymously for those who are afraid of public speaking).
- lots of discussion opportunity, she welcomed all questions and was very accommodating to all of the students.
- created a safe space for all too feel comfortable participating and explained reasonings for her topics clear and concise
- I had a fairly bad depressive episode this quarter, and Rittenhouse did her best to make accommodations for me so that I would still be able to be successful in the class.
- Every week she assigned weekly reviews that allowed student feedback, and if asked and necessary, she would address concerns and welcome feedback
- Professor Rittenhouse creates a learning environment that challenges and supports all students in that she poses critical thinking questions such as possible public policies that could potentially decrease discrimination or her willingness to pause lectures to make sure students understand the newly taught concepts.
- Going to office hours helped clear up any confusion on the various topics that we went over in class because Professor Rittenhouse would take the time to answer any questions that I had and would explain the models in multiple ways to ensure that I understood the material.
- Professor wants class to be interactive and ask for participation and ask questions regarding assigned reading to ensure we are grasping the main ideas. The writing assignments test over multiple lectures to ensure certain key aspects are understood.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.

# ECON 138: Economics of Discrimination

UC San Diego, Spring 2022

Instructor: Katherine Rittenhouse

TA: Alyssa Brown

## Course Content<sup>1</sup>

In this course we will investigate differences in economic outcomes by race, gender, sexual orientation, and other personal characteristics. We will study economic theories of discrimination, empirical work testing those theories, and policies aimed at alleviating group-level differences in economic outcomes. This course is also designed to teach students to read and think critically about academic research, and to discuss controversial topics in a respectful, informed, and inclusive manner.

## Class Schedule and Contact Information

Lecture: Tu Th 9:30-10:50am, HSS 1128A

Professor: Katherine Rittenhouse, [krittenh@ucsd.edu](mailto:krittenh@ucsd.edu)

Office hour: Tuesdays, 11am-12pm (Econ 117)

TA: Alyssa Brown, [aab005@ucsd.edu](mailto:aab005@ucsd.edu)

Office hour: Thursdays, 11am-12pm (Econ 117)

## Your Grade

Assignment	% of Grade	Notes
Writing assignments	50%	<p>Three writing assignments, worth 16.67% of your grade each. Writing assignments will test (a) your knowledge of the concepts covered in class and (b) your ability to apply those concepts to new contexts.</p> <p>Writing assignments will be made available on Friday at 9am, and due on Wednesday by 10pm</p> <p>Writing assignment 1: Available 04/15; Due 04/20 Writing assignment 2: Available 05/06; Due 05/11 Writing assignment 3: Available 05/27; Due 06/01</p> <p>NOTE: If you need an extension due to a family/health crisis, please let us know as soon as possible (and provide any relevant documentation). We cannot grant extensions made &lt;24hours to the deadline.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Professors Kate Antonovics, Prashant Bharadwaj and Alyssa Brown for the original design of this course.

Final exam	25%	Oral exam, based on readings and class discussions. Oral exams will be 15 minute, in-person conversations between the student and instructor. Oral exams will be recorded to ensure consistency.
Participation	15%	<p>Be prepared to answer following questions about the required readings:</p> <p>For academic journal article (introduction only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What is the research question?</li> <li>- What is the approach the authors take to answer this question?</li> <li>- What are the main results the authors find?</li> </ul> <p>For required news articles/short videos, I will ask you to summarize the main points.</p> <p>Each class I will randomly choose students to answer these questions. Full credit will be given for reasonable attempts. That is, I do not care if you give the correct answer or not, but I DO care whether you have attempted to understand the reading. You are welcome to collaborate with your peers ahead of time to prepare for these questions.</p> <p>Participation effort in other parts of class will only help (not hurt) your grade.</p> <p>NOTE: If you are unable to make it to class or were unable to complete the readings, <b>email me ahead of time</b> and I will not call on you.</p>
Reflection surveys	10%	<p>There will be 10 weekly reflection surveys. These will be short, and graded for completion:</p> <p>Full credit – a decent attempt made to thoughtfully answer all the questions  Half credit – some attempt made to answer most of the questions  No credit – Not submitted, or very little attempt made to consider the questions.</p> <p>Reflection surveys will be made available after class on Thursdays, and due by Sunday 11:59pm.</p>

## Administrative Issues

- (1) If you have a documented disability, please bring your documentation to me as soon as possible so that I can make suitable accommodations for you. If you believe that you have a disability and desire accommodation, please register with the Office for Students with Disabilities
- (2) Academic Integrity:  
By enrolling in this course, you agree to:
  - rely solely on your own work in connection with all assessments, problems, homework and assignments (unless collaboration is expressly permitted);
  - complete all tests and assignments on your own, unless collaboration on an assignment is explicitly permitted;

- acknowledge any and all external sources used in your work;
- maintain only one user account;
- not let anyone else use my username and/or password;
- not engage in any activity that would dishonestly improve your results, or improve or hurt the results of others;
- not post answers to problems that are being used to assess learner performance.

Any student who violates UC San Diego's academic integrity policy will earn a failing grade for the course. In addition, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs will impose a disciplinary penalty.

### **Class Overview:**

	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Week 1 03/28	Course Introduction / Econometrics catch up	How economists think about discrimination	
Week 2 04/04	Oaxaca decomposition / Profit maximization review	Models of discrimination I	
Week 3 04/11	Models of discrimination II	Models of discrimination III	<b>WA 1 posted Fri 04/15</b>
Week 4 04/18	Race & employment I	Race & employment I	<b>WA 1 due Wed 04/20</b>
Week 5 04/25	Gender I	Gender II	
Week 6 05/02	LGBT	Asian Americans	<b>WA 2 posted Fri 05/06</b>
Week 7 05/09	Affirmative Action I	Affirmative Action II	<b>WA 2 due Wed 05/11</b>
Week 8 05/16	Health	NO CLASS	
Week 9 05/23	Crime I: Racial profiling	Crime II: Police use of force	<b>WA 3 posted Fri 05/27</b>
Week 10 05/30	Crime III: Justice system	Discrimination in Academia and in Economics	<b>WA 3 due Wed 06/01</b>

## Class Readings:

All readings marked with a \* should be done prior to lecture. Readings **without** a \* are not required, and will be covered in class. Note, **for any required academic journal articles, you are only asked to read the introduction.**

### Week 1

#### March 29: Class Introduction / Econometrics Catch-Up

- Syllabus
- Egap, “10 things to know about reading a regression table”: topics 1-4
- Evans, “How to interpret regression coefficients”

#### March 31: How Economists Think About Discrimination

- \* Sloane, Hurst and Black, “A Cross-Cohort Analysis of Human Capital Specialization and the College Gender Wage Gap” (up through page 4)
- \* [“Women are slowly pursuing more high-paying degrees, but the pay gap remains, says new research.”](#)
- Daly et al. “Disappointing Facts about the Black-White Wage Gap” FRBSF Economic Letters
- Chetty et al. Race and Economic Opportunity in the United States – Executive Summary

### Week 2

#### April 5: Oaxaca Decomposition / Profit Maximization Review

- \* Exercise 1 – try to fill out missing boxes before class using Econ 1 knowledge!
- “Measuring Discrimination Oaxaca decomp”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NQaA8OAIcag>
- “Maximizing Profit Practice” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BQvtnjWZ0ig>

#### April 7: Models of discrimination I (Preference-based discrimination overview)

- \*Hjort, Jonas. “Ethnic divisions and production in firms.” 2014. Quarterly Journal of Economics. **(Read pages 1900 – 1903)**
- Murphy, Kevin. “How Gary Becker Saw the Scourge of Discrimination.” Chicago Booth Review, University of Chicago, 15 June 2015.

## Week 3

### April 12: Models of discrimination II (Statistical discrimination overview)

- \*Bartos et al. "Attention Discrimination: Theory and Field Experiments with Monitoring Information Acquisition." American Economic Review. **Read pages 1437-1440 (Up through "Later, we also discuss alternative explanations.")**
- Moro, Andrea. "Statistical Discrimination." The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

### April 14: Models of discrimination III

- \* Bohren et al, "The Dynamics of Discrimination: Theory and Evidence." American Economic Review 2019, 109(10). Read pages 3395-3400, 3426-3427.
- \* "Housing Segregation and Redlining in America: A Short History"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O5FBJyqfoLM>
- Bohren et al, "Systemic Discrimination: Theory and Measurement" NBER Working Paper (2022). (pages 1-4)

## Week 4

### April 19: Race and employment I

- \*Neal and Johnson. "The Role of Premarket Factors in Black-White Wage Differences." The Journal of Political Economy, vol. 104, no. 5, 1996. Read pages 869-871, 891-892.
- \*Fryer et al. "Racial Disparities in Job Finding and Offered Wages." Journal of Law and Economics, University of Chicago Press, vol. 56(3). Read pages 633-637, 666-670.

### April 21: Race and employment II

- \* "Exposing Housing Discrimination", <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rP7WBiqg8Dk>
- \* Bertrand and Mullainathan, "Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." American Economic Review, Vol. 94 No. 4, 2004.
- Agan and Starr, "Ban the Box, Criminal Records, and Racial Discrimination: A Field Experiment." The Quarterly Journal of Economics (2018).

## Week 5

### April 26: Gender I

- \* Klevin et al, "Children and Gender Inequality: Evidence from Denmark" American Economic Journal: Applied Economics (2019).
- \* Gneezy et al, "Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender Differences." The Quarterly Journal of Economics, August 2003.

## April 28: Gender II

- \* Bursztyn et al. "Acting Wife": Marriage Market Incentives and Labor Market Investments." *American Economic Review*, vol. 107, no. 11, 2017.
- \* "Are men and women evaluated differently in the labor market?"  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O2LcjoU6aAo>
- Bertrand et al (2010). "Dynamics of the Gender Gap for Young Professionals in the Finance and Corporate Sectors". *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*.

## Week 6

### May 3: LGBT

- \* "Why Supreme Court's LGBTQ employment discrimination ruling marks a 'milestone'."  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fxh\\_epZ3d60](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fxh_epZ3d60)
- \* Aksoy, Carpenter and Frank, "Sexual orientation and earnings: New Evidence from the United Kingdom." 2018. *ILR Review*.
- Burn and Martell, "Gender Typicality and Sexual Minority Labor Market Differentials." University of Liverpool Management School Working Paper in Economics #202018, June 2020.
- Tilcsik, "Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 117, No. 2 (September 2011).
- Campbell, Travis and Lee Badgett, M. V. and Brennan, Everest, "Beyond the Gender Binary: Transgender Labor Force Status in the United States 2014-2017", Working Paper, February 12, 2021.

### May 5: Asian Americans

- \* Park, "I'm done being your model minority." *The New York Times*, March 2022
- \* Hilger, "Upward Mobility and Discrimination: The Case of Asian Americans." Working Paper, March 2017.
- \* Hong and Bromwich, "Asian-Americans are being attacked. Why are hate crime charges so rare?" *The New York Times*, March 2021.
- Lu and Sheng, "From Fear to Hate: How A Pandemic Sparks Racial Animus in the United States." 21<sup>st</sup> Century China Center Research Paper, July 2020.
- Chin, "Long-Run Labor Market Effects of Japanese American Internment during World War II on Working-Age Male Internees." *Journal of Labor Economics* 23:3 (2005).

## Week 7

### May 10: Affirmative Action I

- \* "White Students' Unfair Advantage in Admissions." *NYT Opinions*, 2017.
- \* Arcidiacono and Lovenheim, "Affirmative Action and the Quality-Fit Trade-off." *Journal of Economic Literature* 2016, 54(1).

### May 12: Affirmative Action II

- \* Antonovics and Backes. 2014. "The effect of banning affirmative action on college admissions policies and student quality." *Journal of Human Resources* 49 (2).
- \* Bleemer, "Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility after California's Proposition 209." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 2022.

### Week 8

#### May 17: Health

- \* Alsan and Wanamaker, "Tuskegee and the Health of Black Men." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (2018).
- \* Alsan, Garrick and Graziani, "Does Diversity Matter for Health? Experimental Evidence from Oakland." *American Economic Review* (2019)
- Hoffman, Trawalter, Axt and Oliver. "Racial bias in pain assessment and treatment recommendations, and false beliefs about biological differences between blacks and whites." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(16), 4296-4301.

#### May 19: NO CLASS

### Week 9

#### May 24: Crime I

- \* Antonovics and Knight. 2009. "A New Look at Racial Profiling: Evidence from the Boston Police Department". *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91:1.
- \* Goncalves and Mello, "A Few Bad Apples? Racial Bias in Policing." Conditionally accepted at *American Economic Review*, June 2020.
- \* "San Diego Law Enforcement Searches Blacks More, Finds Contraband on Them Less." *Voice of San Diego*, December 2019.

#### May 26: Crime II

- \* Fryer, "An Empirical Analysis of Racial Differences in Police Use of Force." *Journal of Political Economy*, 2019, vol. 127, no. 3.
- \* Hoekstra and Sloan, "Does Race Matter for Police Use of Force? Evidence from 911 Calls." NBER Working Paper 26774, February 2020.
- Ang, D. (2021). The effects of police violence on inner-city students. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 136(1), 115-168.

### Week 10

#### May 30: Crime III

- \* Arnold, Dobbie and Yang, "Racial Bias in Bail Decisions" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2018.
- "Smoking-gun evidence emerges for racial bias in American courts." *The Economist*, January 2020.

June 2: Discrimination in academia and the field of economics

- \*Sarsons, Heather. 2017. "Recognition for Group Work: Gender Differences in Academia." *American Economic Review*, 107 (5): 141-45.
- \*Antecol Bedard and Stearns, "Equal but Inequitable: Who Benefits from Gender-Neutral Tenure Clock Stopping Policies?" *American Economic Review* 2018.
- Wu, "Gendered Language on the Economics Job Market Rumors Forum." AEA Papers and Proceedings 2018.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (A)  
Fall Quarter 2021

**Number of Students Enrolled: 64**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 22**

### **PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Your class level is

1 (4.5%):	Freshman
2 (9.1%):	Sophomore
9 (40.9%):	Junior
10 (45.5%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

14 (63.6%):	Major
3 (13.6%):	Minor
2 (9.1%):	Gen. Ed.
3 (13.6%):	Elective
0 (0.0%):	Interest

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

12 (54.5%):	A
7 (31.8%):	B
0 (0.0%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
3 (13.6%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (9.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (45.5%):	Agree
10 (45.5%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

1 (4.5%):	0-1
4 (18.2%):	2-3
8 (36.4%):	4-5
2 (9.1%):	6-7
5 (22.7%):	8-9
0 (0.0%):	10-11
1 (4.5%):	12-13
0 (0.0%):	14-15
1 (4.5%):	16-17
0 (0.0%):	18-19
0 (0.0%):	20 or more

6. How often do you attend this course?

2 (9.1%):	Very Rarely
7 (31.8%):	Some of the Time
13 (59.1%):	Most of the Time

## **COURSE MATERIAL ECON 138**

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (50.0%):	Agree
11 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

8. Assignments promote learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (9.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (63.6%):	Agree
6 (27.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**9. Required reading is useful.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (4.5%):	Disagree
4 (18.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (54.5%):	Agree
5 (22.7%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**10. This course is difficult relative to others.**

1 (4.5%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (13.6%):	Disagree
7 (31.8%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
8 (36.4%):	Agree
3 (13.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**11. Exams are representative of the course material.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
18 (81.8%):	Agree
4 (18.2%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**12. Do you recommend this course overall?**

22 (100.0%):	Yes
0 (0.0%):	No

**13. Course ECON 138:**

- great course that covers discrimination and how it ties to economics
- The course is really helpful and I have learned a great deal of material from it. It touches very important topics and I believe that I will be able to utilize what I have learned in the future.
- hope to see this class made a requirement for economics majors/minors!
- Learned a lot about very important topics
- I learned a great deal in this class and found each lecture engaging with interesting points and observations made.

**14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:**

- exams are very representative of the materials we learned in class
- Quizzes were pretty hard, harder than the class material.
- Quizzes and papers are fairly easy, but I wish the writing assignment grading was a little more lenient.

**15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:**

- readings are really useful in this class. Help us in writing papers and when taking quizzes
- The readings were too long!! Some of the papers were 100s pages long and a normal student doesn't have time to read 200 pages in one day!

**INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

**16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
14 (63.6%): Agree  
8 (36.4%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (4.5%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
13 (59.1%): Agree  
8 (36.4%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (4.5%): Disagree  
3 (13.6%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
11 (50.0%): Agree  
7 (31.8%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**19. Instructor explains the course material well.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
2 (9.1%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
13 (59.1%): Agree  
7 (31.8%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**20. Lectures hold your attention.**

1 (4.5%): Strongly Disagree  
2 (9.1%): Disagree  
4 (18.2%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
10 (45.5%): Agree  
5 (22.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
4 (18.2%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (54.5%):	Agree
6 (27.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (4.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (63.6%):	Agree
7 (31.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (9.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
15 (68.2%):	Agree
5 (22.7%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
2 (9.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
13 (59.1%):	Agree
6 (27.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (4.5%):	Not Applicable

**25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (63.6%):	Agree
8 (36.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (63.6%):	Agree
8 (36.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (54.5%):	Agree
10 (45.5%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:

- great professor who knows the material well
- Prof Rittenhouse is knowledgeable on the topics she teaches and does a good job addressing questions and possible solutions.
- She was a little monotonous and some of her lectures were boring, however, she understands material and whenever you have a question she can answer clearly and coherently.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

21 (95.5%):	Yes
1 (4.5%):	No

### **Custom Question 5**

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

- always facilitated question asking and participation

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (B)  
Fall Quarter 2021

**Number of Students Enrolled: 70**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 17**

### **PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Your class level is

2 (11.8%):	Freshman
1 (5.9%):	Sophomore
2 (11.8%):	Junior
12 (70.6%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

9 (60.0%):	Major
3 (20.0%):	Minor
1 (6.7%):	Gen. Ed.
2 (13.3%):	Elective
0 (0.0%):	Interest
2:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

9 (60.0%):	A
5 (33.3%):	B
0 (0.0%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
1 (6.7%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
2:	[No Response]

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

2 (13.3%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (6.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
6 (40.0%): Agree  
6 (40.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

4 (26.7%): 0-1  
3 (20.0%): 2-3  
4 (26.7%): 4-5  
1 (6.7%): 6-7  
1 (6.7%): 8-9  
1 (6.7%): 10-11  
0 (0.0%): 12-13  
0 (0.0%): 14-15  
0 (0.0%): 16-17  
0 (0.0%): 18-19  
1 (6.7%): 20 or more  
2: [No Response]

6. How often do you attend this course?

2 (13.3%): Very Rarely  
2 (13.3%): Some of the Time  
11 (73.3%): Most of the Time  
2: [No Response]

## **COURSE MATERIAL ECON 138**

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

2 (13.3%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (6.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (33.3%): Agree  
7 (46.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

2 (13.3%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
2 (13.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (33.3%): Agree  
5 (33.3%): Strongly Agree  
1 (6.7%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

## 9. Required reading is useful.

1 (6.7%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
4 (26.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (33.3%): Agree  
5 (33.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

## 10. This course is difficult relative to others.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
4 (26.7%): Disagree  
4 (26.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
3 (20.0%): Agree  
4 (26.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

## 11. Exams are representative of the course material.

1 (6.7%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
4 (26.7%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
6 (40.0%): Agree  
4 (26.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
2: [No Response]

## 12. Do you recommend this course overall?

14 (93.3%): Yes  
1 (6.7%): No  
2: [No Response]

## 13. Course ECON 138:

- Class has given me a perspective on the struggles of under represented minorities and has allowed me ways to think about how people are treated as a result of discrimination as well as consider how important it is to think not just outside of my own perspective but see how research papers are created and what conclusions can be drawn from said papers.
- As difficult as the course is, and unexpectedly math-heavy, I believe ECON 138 is a necessary class to take because of the breadth of material it covers in the realm of discrimination.
- Really informative course that takes economics away from math to more discussion related topics. The only problem is the amount of tedious assignments and that there is a change of several professors that change the rythm of the course in the middle of the quarter.

## 14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- Quizzes were difficult and sometime unnecessarily tricky.

- Some of the questions are rather subjective and the correction of the assignments by the TA is more than questionable

**15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:**

- Readings were long and difficult at times, but lectures helped break them down.

**INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

**16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.**

0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
1 (7.1%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
6 (42.9%):      Agree  
7 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
3:                [No Response]

**17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.**

0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
1 (7.1%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (35.7%):      Agree  
8 (57.1%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
3:                [No Response]

**18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.**

1 (7.1%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
2 (14.3%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (35.7%):      Agree  
6 (42.9%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
3:                [No Response]

**19. Instructor explains the course material well.**

1 (7.1%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (35.7%):      Agree  
8 (57.1%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
3:                [No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

1 (7.1%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 (35.7%):	Agree
7 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
5 (35.7%):	Agree
7 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
6 (42.9%):	Agree
7 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
6 (42.9%):	Agree
7 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
6 (42.9%):	Agree
7 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
3:	[No Response]

25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
7 (50.0%): Agree  
7 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
7 (50.0%): Agree  
7 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (7.1%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
5 (35.7%): Agree  
8 (57.1%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:

- I always felt lost because there was a lot of vagueness in explanations.
- Professor Rittenhouse demonstrated strong grasp of the material, and she lectured very well.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

13 (92.9%): Yes  
1 (7.1%): No  
3: [No Response]

**Custom Question 5**

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are

made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (C)  
Fall Quarter 2021

**Number of Students Enrolled: 63**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 23**

### PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

1 (4.3%):	Freshman
3 (13.0%):	Sophomore
8 (34.8%):	Junior
11 (47.8%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

7 (41.2%):	Major
1 (5.9%):	Minor
7 (41.2%):	Gen. Ed.
2 (11.8%):	Elective
0 (0.0%):	Interest
6:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

9 (50.0%):	A
4 (22.2%):	B
2 (11.1%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
3 (16.7%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
5:	[No Response]

## GENERAL QUESTIONS

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

1 (5.6%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (61.1%):	Agree
4 (22.2%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

0 (0.0%):	0-1
4 (22.2%):	2-3
4 (22.2%):	4-5
3 (16.7%):	6-7
4 (22.2%):	8-9
1 (5.6%):	10-11
2 (11.1%):	12-13
0 (0.0%):	14-15
0 (0.0%):	16-17
0 (0.0%):	18-19
0 (0.0%):	20 or more
5:	[No Response]

6. How often do you attend this course?

0 (0.0%):	Very Rarely
6 (33.3%):	Some of the Time
12 (66.7%):	Most of the Time
5:	[No Response]

## COURSE MATERIAL ECON 138

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

1 (5.6%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (61.1%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

1 (5.6%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
8 (44.4%):	Agree
8 (44.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**9. Required reading is useful.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (50.0%):	Agree
7 (38.9%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**10. This course is difficult relative to others.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
7 (38.9%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
8 (44.4%):	Agree
3 (16.7%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**11. Exams are representative of the course material.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
8 (44.4%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
2 (11.1%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**12. Do you recommend this course overall?**

15 (83.3%):	Yes
3 (16.7%):	No
5:	[No Response]

**13. Course ECON 138:**

- I learned a lot from this class. The course is dense in terms of materials, but the readings and papers are really interesting. The format of the class is also good
- The course content is very interesting and gives a different perspective on things we may not encounter in our everyday lives. I am glad to have a broader understanding of the world and the discriminatory practices that underlie seemingly unbiased things, whether that bias be intentional and implicit or not.
- This course was extremely well organised and insightful, and taught me a great deal not only about the course's pedagogical focus, but also how to think with an economics mindset.
- It's a little bit hard. And the writing TA are all tough graders

#### 14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:

- Hard
- The quizzes sometimes asked questions that I believe didn't fundamentally assess your understanding of theory, but rather asked specific details.  
The papers were fair, but 48 hours seems too short.
- Surprisingly, I enjoyed writing the papers! They were a nice break from quizzes, and were more helpful in getting me to understand what we were learning by answering specific questions that tied in the readings and our modules.
- Papers: The papers help me to understand the course materials better.  
Quizzes: Challenging but reflect course materials
- I thought the quizzes and written assignment were fair and enhanced my learning experience.
- We haven't had any exams yet, but the grading on the papers seems to be inconsistent.

#### 15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:

[No Responses]

#### **INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

#### 16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (61.1%):	Agree
6 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

#### 17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (50.0%):	Agree
6 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

#### 18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (16.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (55.6%):	Agree
4 (22.2%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
8 (44.4%):	Agree
7 (38.9%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Disagree
3 (16.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (50.0%):	Agree
3 (16.7%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (55.6%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (66.7%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (66.7%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (11.1%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (61.1%):	Agree
4 (22.2%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (61.1%):	Agree
5 (27.8%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (55.6%):	Agree
6 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (5.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (50.0%):	Agree
7 (38.9%):	Strongly Agree
1 (5.6%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:**

- Never had her for this course, no experience with her teaching.
- Instructor Rittenhouse is no doubt an extremely capable economist with a passion about the discipline. However, at times it seemed that she lacked the same energy as the other instructors for the course and seemed unfamiliar with the readings.
- The audio was slightly muffled in her lectures, but it should be an easy fix (not to use headphones, or change the microphone input) for future courses. Her lectures were very clear, and her slides summarized the most important points very well. I liked her teaching style, in how she would first show the table or figure and interpret the results with us, then write everything down on the slide after to make sure she had covered the main topics thoroughly.

These were great summary slides to study off of and confirm that we had understood the figures properly.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

16 (88.9%): Yes  
2 (11.1%): No  
5: [No Response]

**Custom Question 5**

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (D)  
Fall Quarter 2021

**Number of Students Enrolled: 63**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 21**

### PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

0 (0.0%):	Freshman
3 (14.3%):	Sophomore
10 (47.6%):	Junior
8 (38.1%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

10 (55.6%):	Major
1 (5.6%):	Minor
4 (22.2%):	Gen. Ed.
2 (11.1%):	Elective
1 (5.6%):	Interest
3:	[No Response]

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

7 (38.9%):	A
6 (33.3%):	B
3 (16.7%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
2 (11.1%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP
3:	[No Response]

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

2 (11.1%): Strongly Disagree  
2 (11.1%): Disagree  
1 (5.6%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 (22.2%): Agree  
9 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
3: [No Response]

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

1 (5.6%): 0-1  
7 (38.9%): 2-3  
2 (11.1%): 4-5  
2 (11.1%): 6-7  
0 (0.0%): 8-9  
2 (11.1%): 10-11  
0 (0.0%): 12-13  
0 (0.0%): 14-15  
1 (5.6%): 16-17  
0 (0.0%): 18-19  
3 (16.7%): 20 or more  
3: [No Response]

6. How often do you attend this course?

2 (11.8%): Very Rarely  
3 (17.6%): Some of the Time  
12 (70.6%): Most of the Time  
4: [No Response]

## **COURSE MATERIAL ECON 138**

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

2 (11.8%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (5.9%): Disagree  
2 (11.8%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
3 (17.6%): Agree  
9 (52.9%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
4: [No Response]

8. Assignments promote learning.

1 (6.3%): Strongly Disagree  
2 (12.5%): Disagree  
2 (12.5%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 (25.0%): Agree  
7 (43.8%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
5: [No Response]

**9. Required reading is useful.**

1 (6.3%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (25.0%):	Agree
9 (56.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**10. This course is difficult relative to others.**

1 (6.3%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Disagree
6 (37.5%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (12.5%):	Agree
4 (25.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**11. Exams are representative of the course material.**

1 (6.3%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (6.3%):	Disagree
3 (18.8%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 (25.0%):	Agree
7 (43.8%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
5:	[No Response]

**12. Do you recommend this course overall?**

11 (68.8%):	Yes
5 (31.3%):	No
5:	[No Response]

**13. Course ECON 138:**

- It's difficult and challenging.
- Very interesting course, get to touch on a variety of topics that can relate to a lot of real-world broader issues. Often approaches hard-hitting topics in a more unbiased manner, so it gives you a lot of freedom to think about things for yourself.

**14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:**

- Sometimes they are really hard.

**15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:**

- Students need to read a lot.

## **INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
2 (14.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
3 (21.4%): Agree  
9 (64.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
7: [No Response]

17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
3 (21.4%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
2 (14.3%): Agree  
9 (64.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
7: [No Response]

18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
2 (14.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
3 (21.4%): Agree  
9 (64.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
7: [No Response]

19. Instructor explains the course material well.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
3 (21.4%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
2 (14.3%): Agree  
9 (64.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
7: [No Response]

20. Lectures hold your attention.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (7.1%): Disagree  
3 (21.4%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
2 (14.3%): Agree  
8 (57.1%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
7: [No Response]

**21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (21.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
2 (14.3%):	Agree
9 (64.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
7:	[No Response]

**22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (21.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Agree
10 (71.4%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
7:	[No Response]

**23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (21.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
11 (78.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
7:	[No Response]

**24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (21.4%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
3 (21.4%):	Agree
8 (57.1%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
7:	[No Response]

**25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
4 (28.6%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
1 (7.1%):	Agree
9 (64.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
7:	[No Response]

**26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.**

0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
3 (21.4%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
1 (7.1%):      Agree  
10 (71.4%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
7:                  [No Response]

**27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.**

0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
3 (21.4%):      Neither Agree nor Disagree  
1 (7.1%):      Agree  
10 (71.4%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
7:                  [No Response]

**28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:**

- She makes the lectures very clear, logical and helpful for exams.

**29. Do you recommend this professor overall?**

12 (80.0%):      Yes  
3 (20.0%):      No  
6:                  [No Response]

**Custom Question 5**

**30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.**

- Professor Rittenhouse was really good about finding numerous different ways to present a topic so it felt like she was appealing to all students. I also appreciated how often she would check in with students during lecture, and explained both how she first interpreted data and how it actually plays out in the research papers. She also navigated through several difficult modules but I was super impressed with how she navigated more touchy subjects.
- Every class is very, very good and highly recommended

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.

# ECON 138: The Economics of Discrimination Fall 2021

**This syllabus pertains to ALL sections of ECON 138: Aoo, Boo, Coo, and Doo.**  
**Please read carefully as the structure of this class is slightly different from what you might be used to.**

*All times are in PDT. We reserve the right to make any changes to the syllabus as the quarter progresses. You are responsible for checking Canvas regularly for updates and announcements.*

## **Course content overview**

This course will investigate differences in economic outcomes by race, gender, sexual orientation, and other personal characteristics. We will study economic theories of discrimination, empirical work testing those theories, and policies aimed at alleviating group-level differences in economic outcomes. This course is also designed to teach students how to discuss controversial topics in a respectful, informed, and inclusive manner. Thanks to Professors Kate Antonovics and Prashant Bharadwaj for the original design of this course.

## **Course structure**

Previously, this class has been taught by one instructor in a traditional lecture format. This quarter, we are excited to have three co-instructors, with each of us teaching the material we are most passionate about. Each section has the following structure:

**M/W 8-9:20am:** Remote Zoom lecture, combined with discussion about an assigned reading or video. **The hour-long lecture will be recorded and posted to Canvas.**

**T/Th 8-9:20am:** Class is remote, synchronous, and via Zoom. Material presented during class will be similar to the M/W lecture. **This will not be recorded, but all materials will be posted on Canvas.**

**T/Th 3:30-4:50pm, 5:00-6:20pm:** Class is in-person. Material presented during class will be similar to the M/W lecture. **. This will not be recorded, but all materials will be posted on Canvas.**

**All sections: Students in all sections will only be tested on lecture material and materials posted to Canvas.**

	<b>Format</b>	<b>Recorded?</b>	<b>Materials posted to Canvas?</b>

<b>M/W 8-9:20am</b>	Remote (Zoom) Join URL: <a href="https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/98853463777?pwd=T29RRXpiRENhcDk3WGJIMnZIM2Z5dz09">https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/98853463777?pwd=T29RRXpiRENhcDk3WGJIMnZIM2Z5dz09</a>	Yes	Yes
<b>T/Th 8-9:20am</b>	Remote (Zoom) Join URL: <a href="https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/95623810275?pwd=R1hja1JBOEdGbndPcjJ1cmpXbjdhdz09">https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/95623810275?pwd=R1hja1JBOEdGbndPcjJ1cmpXbjdhdz09</a>	No	Yes
<b>T/Th 3:30-4:50pm</b>	In person Mandeville Center B-210	No	Yes
<b>T/Th 5-6:20pm</b>	In person Mandeville Center B-210	No	Yes

### **Teaching Staff**

Professor Prashant Bharadwaj

- Office hour: 12:30-2:30pm Wednesdays (in person with a zoom option)
- ECON 318 or Join URL:  
<https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/98558814917?pwd=bGVDNkdFVUNCeHR3bDZZcVlmTWE3Zz09>
- Email: [prbharadwaj@ucsd.edu](mailto:prbharadwaj@ucsd.edu)

Professor Katherine Rittenhouse

- Office hour: 12:30-2:30pm Wednesdays (in person with a zoom option)
- ECON 117 or Join URL:  
<https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/98558814917?pwd=bGVDNkdFVUNCeHR3bDZZcVlmTWE3Zz09>
- Email: [krittenh@ucsd.edu](mailto:krittenh@ucsd.edu)

Professor Alyssa Brown

- Office hour: 12:30-2:30pm Wednesdays (zoom only)

- Join URL:  
<https://ucsd.zoom.us/j/98558814917?pwd=bGVDNkdFVUNCeHR3bDZZcVlmTWE3Zz09>
- Email: [aaboo5@ucsd.edu](mailto:aaboo5@ucsd.edu)

Each professor will only hold office hours during the weeks they are teaching.

### **Course elements and Grading**

Course element	Percent
Writing assignments 3 writing assignments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Due October 9 (15%), October 30 (15%), and November 20 (15%)</li> <li>- Open Thursday at 6:30pm PDT</li> <li>- Due Saturday at 6:30pm PDT</li> </ul>	45%
Quizzes (9 quizzes, lowest 2 quizzes dropped, 5% each) Quizzes posted on Fridays at 12pm PDT, due Sundays at 12pm PDT, during Weeks 1-10. (No quiz over Thanksgiving holiday.)	35%
Final exam: Free response / essay questions. MUST BE TAKEN AT REGISTRAR ASSIGNED TIME FOR YOUR CLASS; SEE WEBREG.	20%

**Lecture (M/W):** Lectures will consist of traditional lecture, and class discussion. Lecture will present theory/evidence and go over the papers on your reading list. The class discussion will be about a short reading or video that you must complete prior to lecture (the starred resources in your reading list). Discussion questions will be posted on the discussion board at least 24 hours prior to lecture; you're encouraged to discuss them on the discussion board with your peers.

**Other classes (Tu/Th):** Classes on these days will be similar to the M/W lecture. Class will not be recorded.

**Discussion Board:** We have a discussion board for you to ask and answer questions related to course content. Please use this discussion board rather than email unless you need to discuss a private matter. We will answer questions on the discussion board and via email within 24 hours.

**Quizzes:** There will be weekly timed multiple-choice quizzes in Weeks 1-10 based on the lecture, readings, and in-class discussions from the previous week. Once you start a quiz you will only have an hour to do it. You cannot take quizzes multiple times. Quizzes are designed to make sure you are keeping up with the material for the week. Quizzes will be posted on Fridays at 12pm PDT and due Sundays at 12pm PDT.

**Written Assignments:** Writing assignments ask you to apply class content to readings and topics that we haven't directly covered in class. All written assignments must be submitted via Canvas. Students agree that by taking this course all required papers will be subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin.com for the detection of plagiarism. All submitted papers will be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of such papers. Use of the Turnitin.com service is subject to the terms of use agreement posted on the Turnitin.com site.

You will be given 48 hours to complete each writing assignment. PLEASE ALLOW EXTRA TIME FOR THE FIRST SUBMISSION. We do not accept email submissions.

If you need an extension on a writing assignment because of a family/health crisis, please email us ASAP. It's much easier to give you an extension when you let us know prior to the deadline.

**Final Exam:** The final exam will be a written exam made up of free response / essay questions. More information will be provided closer to the exam time. If you are unable to take the final exam at the assigned time FOR YOUR CLASS, please let us know by October 15th if you would like to schedule an oral exam which all three instructors will administer. After October 15th, it is assumed that you will take the final at the assigned time by the registrar.

**Administrative issues:**

1. If you have a documented disability and desire accommodation, please register with the Office for Students with Disabilities. They will contact me directly with all the information I need to make this a fair classroom.
2. UCSD has automated waitlists. If you have any questions regarding adding the class, please contact the undergraduate advisors in Economics.

**Cheating:** If you normally rely on tutoring services or forms of cheating to excel in your coursework, please do not take this class. You will not find these services useful and We will fail you if we find evidence of cheating. We expect you to work hard and earn a grade that's fair to you and your peers.

Students are expected to do their own work, as outlined in the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship. All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Academic Integrity Coordinator. In addition to the penalties imposed by the Academic Integrity Review Board, we also reserve the right to fail students found guilty of academic misconduct.

The following are a few examples of academic dishonesty in this class:

- Having someone else complete an assignment for you or give you answers to specific questions (including the Econ Tutor or other tutoring services).
- Having someone else take your exam for you.
- Lying about having taken an exam or completed an assignment.
- Copying sentences from a website without citing it and using quotations.

You are expected to know and understand UCSD rules regarding plagiarism. Please visit this website and go through all the scenarios: <https://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu/faq/index.html>

If you have a question about whether something might be considered as plagiarism, please ask us.

**Email Policy:** You are welcome to email us if you have questions about the class. However, you are highly encouraged to read the syllabus (this document) and consult with your peers before doing so. Finally, content related questions (“Why does the demand curve shift to the left when X happens? I didn’t understand that in class”) WILL NOT be answered via email. For these, please come to office hours, or ask during or after class.

Please read the following guide on how to email faculty. This is highly encouraged.

### **Class Schedule and Readings:**

Readings and videos with a \* must be done before lecture and will be discussed during the in-class discussion. I encourage you to do all other readings prior to lecture as well. All readings are posted on Canvas. **You are only responsible for the introductions and conclusions of journal articles unless otherwise noted;** the exact pages are listed in the paper citation.

	<b>Monday/Tuesday Lecture</b>	<b>Wednesday/Thursday Lecture</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Week 0 Prof. Bharadwaj			<i>Introduction to the class; instruction begins Thursday Sept 23 (Module 0)</i>
Week 1 (09/27) Prof. Bharadwaj	Module 1: Introduction	Module 2: Oaxaca Decomposition	
Week 2 (10/4) Prof. Bharadwaj	Module 3: Becker model 1	Module 4: Becker model 2	<b>Writing Assignment 1 Due Saturday 10/9</b>
Week 3 (10/11)	Module 5: Statistical	Module 6: Statistical	

Prof. Bharadwaj	model	model	
Week 4 (10/18) Prof. Bharadwaj	Module 7: Critiques	Module 8: Review	
Week 5 (10/25) Prof. Rittenhouse	Module 9: Race & employment I	Module 10: Race & employment II	<b>Writing Assignment 2 Due Saturday 10/30</b>
Week 6 (11/1) Prof. Brown	Module 11: Gender	Module 12: Affirmative action	
Week 7 (11/8) Prof. Brown	Module 13: Health	Module 14: Asian Americans	<i>No class Thursday (Veterans Day)</i>
Week 8 (11/15) Prof. Brown/ Prof. Rittenhouse	Module 15: LGBT	Module 16: Police use of force	<b>Writing Assignment 3 Due Saturday 11/20</b>
Week 9 (11/22) Prof. Rittenhouse	Module 17: Racial profiling	Module 18: Policy solutions	<i>No class Thursday (Thanksgiving)</i>
Week 10 (11/29) Prof. Bharadwaj	Module 19: Discrimination outside US	Module 20: Discrimination in Economics/Wrap Up	

**Module 0 (Th September 23):** Class Introduction / Econometrics Catch-Up

- Syllabus
- Egap, “10 things to know about reading a regression table”: topics 1-4
- Evans, “How to interpret regression coefficients”

**Module 1 (M Sept 27):** How Economists Think About Discrimination

- \* “How disadvantaged neighborhoods amplify racial inequality”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=lYSc7oNotfQ>
- Daly et al. “Disappointing Facts about the Black-White Wage Gap” FRBSF Economic Letters
- Chetty et al. Race and Economic Opportunity in the United States – Executive Summary

**Module 2 (W Sept 29):** Oaxaca Decomposition / Profit Maximization Review

- \* Exercise 1 – try to fill out missing boxes before class using Econ 1 knowledge!
- “Measuring Discrimination Oaxaca decomp”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NQaA8OAlCag>
- “Maximizing Profit Practice” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BQvtnjWZoig>

**Module 3 (M October 4): Preference-Based Discrimination: Theory**

- \* “Housing Segregation and Redlining in America: A Short History”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O5FBJyqfOLM>
- Murphy, Kevin. “How Gary Becker Saw the Scourge of Discrimination.” Chicago Booth Review, University of Chicago, 15 June 2015.

**Module 4 (W October 6): Preference-Based Discrimination: Evidence**

- \* Thompson, “School Desegregation and Black Teacher Employment.” NBER Working Paper No. 25990, June 2019. Read pages 1-3, 26-28.
- Holzer and Ihlanfeldt, “Customer Discrimination and Employment Outcomes for Minority Workers.” The Quarterly Journal of Economics Vol. 113, No. 3 (Aug., 1998). Read pages 835-837, 862-863.
- Charles and Guryan, “Prejudice and Wages: An Empirical Assessment of Becker’s The Economics of Discrimination.” Journal of Political Economy, 2008, vol. 116, no. 5. Read pages 773-777, 804-805.

**Module 5 (M October 11): Statistical Discrimination I**

- \* “Exposing Housing Discrimination”,  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rP7WBiqg8Dk>
- Moro, Andrea. “Statistical Discrimination.” The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

**Module 6 (W October 13): Statistical Discrimination II**

- \* Bryson and Chevalier, “Is there a taste for discrimination?” VoxEU, August 2014.
- Bohren et al, “The Dynamics of Discrimination: Theory and Evidence.” American Economic Review 2019, 109(10). Read pages 3395-3400, 3426-3427.

**Module 7 (M October 18): Gaps in how Economists think about discrimination**

- \* Darity et al. “A Tour de Force in Understanding Intergroup Inequality: An Introduction to Stratification Economics.” Review of Black Political Economy, Vol 42: 1-6, 2015.
- \*Akerlof and Kranton. “Economics and Identity.” Quarterly Journal of Economics, 2000. Read Sections 1 (Introduction) 2 (Utility Function and Evidence of Identity-Related Behavior) and 4 (Identity, Economics, and Gender in the Workplace).
- Delgado and Stefancic. “Critical Race Theory: An Introduction” NYU Press, 2006.

**Module 8 (W October 20): Review of Modules 1-7/tie up loose ends****Module 9 (M October 25): Race and Employment I: Observational Studies**

- \* “The Bell Curve Controversy”  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=De\\_PIq3RsHU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=De_PIq3RsHU)
- Neal and Johnson. “The Role of Premarket Factors in Black-White Wage Differences.” *The Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 104, no. 5, 1996. Read pages 869-871, 891-892.
- Fryer et al. “Racial Disparities in Job Finding and Offered Wages.” *Journal of Law and Economics*, University of Chicago Press, vol. 56(3). Read pages 633-637, 666-670.

#### **Module 10 (W October 27): Race and Employment II: Audit Studies**

- \* Lopez, “Study: anti-Black Hiring Discrimination is as prevalent today as it was in 1989.” *Vox*, September 2017.
- Ayres and Siegelman, “Race and Gender Discrimination in Bargaining for a New Car”. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 85, No. 3. (Jun., 1995). Read pages 304-306, 319.
- Bertrand and Mullainathan, “Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination.” *American Economic Review*, Vol. 94 No. 4, 2004. Read pages 991-993, 1011.

#### **Module 11 (M November 1): Gender Wage Gap: Theory and Overview, Evidence**

- \* “Are men and women evaluated differently in the labor market?”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O2LcjoU6aAo>
- “A stunning chart shows the true cause of the gender wage gap.” *Vox*, 2018.
- Bursztyn et al. “Acting Wife’: Marriage Market Incentives and Labor Market Investments.” *American Economic Review*, vol. 107, no. 11, 2017. Read pages 3288-3293, 3317-3318.
- Bertrand et al (2010). “Dynamics of the Gender Gap for Young Professionals in the Finance and Corporate Sectors”. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*. Read pages 228-231, 252-254.
- Gneezy et al, “Performance in Competitive Environments: Gender Differences.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 2003. Read pages 1049-1052, 1070-1072.

#### **Module 12 (W November 3): Affirmative Action: Theory and Overview, at UC**

- \* “White Students’ Unfair Advantage in Admissions.” *NYT Opinions*, 2017.
- Antonovics and Backes. 2014. “The effect of banning affirmative action on college admissions policies and student quality.” *Journal of Human Resources* 49 (2). Read pages 295-296, 321-322.
- Bleemer, “Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility after California’s Proposition 209.” Working paper, 2020. Read pages 1-6, 31-32.

#### **Module 13 (M November 8): Health Disparities / Concordance**

- \* “Racially-biased medical algorithm prioritizes white patients over Black patients”. PBS, 2019.
- Alsan and Wanamaker, “Tuskegee and the Health of Black Men.” The Quarterly Journal of Economics (2018). Read pages 407-413, 450-451.
- Cook et al, “The Mortality Consequences of Distinctively Black Names.” NBER Working Paper No. 21625, October 2015. Read pages 1-3, 13-14.
- “Does physician diversity matter for health outcomes?”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rnboQY1Dy8I>

#### **Module 14 (W November 10): Discrimination against Asian-Americans**

- \* Hong and Bromwich, “Asian-Americans are being attacked. Why are hate crime charges so rare?” The New York Times, March 2021.
- Chin, “Long-Run Labor Market Effects of Japanese American Internment during World War II on Working-Age Male Internees.” Journal of Labor Economics 23:3 (2005). Read pages 491-493, 520-521.
- Hilger, “Upward Mobility and Discrimination: The Case of Asian Americans.” Working Paper, March 2017. Read pages 1-4, 28-29.

#### **Module 15 (M November 15): LGB Discrimination**

- \* “Why Supreme Court’s LGBTQ employment discrimination ruling marks a ‘milestone’.” [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fxh\\_epZ3d6o](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fxh_epZ3d6o)
- Aksoy et al, “Sexual orientation and earnings: How being in a partnership matters.” VoxEU, 2017.
- Burn and Martell, “Gender Typicality and Sexual Minority Labor Market Differentials.” University of Liverpool Management School Working Paper in Economics #202018, June 2020. Read pages 1-2, 27-29.
- Tilcsik, “Pride and Prejudice: Employment Discrimination against Openly Gay Men in the United States.” American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 117, No. 2 (September 2011). Read pages 586-588.

#### **Module 16 (W November 17): Police Use of Force: Evidence**

- \* California’s new police use-of-force law, explained:  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DeI5PPdW\\_vM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DeI5PPdW_vM)
- Fryer, “An Empirical Analysis of Racial Differences in Police Use of Force.” Journal of Political Economy, 2019, vol. 127, no. 3. Read pages 1210-1216, 1258-1259.
- Hoekstra and Sloan, “Does Race Matter for Police Use of Force? Evidence from 911 Calls.” NBER Working Paper 26774, February 2020. Read pages 1-8, 29-31.
- Ang, “Effects of Police Shootings on Inner-City Students.” Quarterly Journal of Economics forthcoming, June 2020. Read pages 1-6, 32-33.
- Kearney et al, “10 Economic Facts about Crime and Incarceration in the United States.” The Hamilton Project, May 2014. Skim through the article and ensure you understand each fact.

**Module 17 (M November 22): Racial Profiling: Evidence**

- \* “San Diego Law Enforcement Searches Blacks More, Finds Contraband on Them Less.” Voice of San Diego, December 2019.
- Antonovics and Knight. 2009. “A New Look at Racial Profiling: Evidence from the Boston Police Department”. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91:1. Read pages 163, 177.
- Goncalves and Mello, “A Few Bad Apples? Racial Bias in Policing.” Conditionally accepted at *American Economic Review*, June 2020. Read pages 1-5, 31-32.
- “Smoking-gun evidence emerges for racial bias in American courts.” *The Economist*, January 2020.

**Module 18 (W November 24): Racial Profiling, Crime, and Incarceration: Policy Solutions**

- \* Doleac, “Do body-worn cameras improve police behavior?” *Brookings*, 2017.
- Agan and Starr, “Ban the Box, Criminal Records, and Racial Discrimination: A Field Experiment.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (2018). Read pages 191-197, 229-231.
- “Machine bias.” *ProPublica*, 2016.

**Module 19 (M November 29): Gender Discrimination in Developing Countries**

- \*Jayachandran, S. “The Roots of Gender Inequality in Developing Countries.” *Annual Review of Economics* 2015
- \*McDougal et al. “Releasing the Tide: How has a Shock to the Acceptability of Gender Based Sexual Violence Affected Rape Reporting to Police in India.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 2018.

**Module 20 (W December 1): Discrimination in the Economics Profession & Class Wrap Up**

- \*Wu, Alice. “Gendered Language on the Economics Job Market Forum.” *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 2018.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

## Course and Instructor Evaluation Summary Department of Economics

Rittenhouse, Katherine  
ECON 1 - Principles of Microeconomics (A)  
Summer Session II 2021

**Number of Students Enrolled: 49**  
**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 30**

### PLEASE COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Your class level is

8 (26.7%):	Freshman
9 (30.0%):	Sophomore
5 (16.7%):	Junior
8 (26.7%):	Senior
0 (0.0%):	Graduate
0 (0.0%):	Extension
0 (0.0%):	Visitor

2. Your reason for taking this class is

13 (43.3%):	Major
0 (0.0%):	Minor
9 (30.0%):	Gen. Ed.
5 (16.7%):	Elective
3 (10.0%):	Interest

3. What grade do you expect in this class?

19 (63.3%):	A
7 (23.3%):	B
2 (6.7%):	C
0 (0.0%):	D
0 (0.0%):	F
2 (6.7%):	P
0 (0.0%):	NP

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS**

4. I learned a great deal from this course.

2 (6.7%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (10.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
14 (46.7%):	Agree
11 (36.7%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

5. How many hours a week do you spend studying outside of class on average?

0 (0.0%):	0-1
10 (33.3%):	2-3
10 (33.3%):	4-5
7 (23.3%):	6-7
2 (6.7%):	8-9
0 (0.0%):	10-11
0 (0.0%):	12-13
1 (3.3%):	14-15
0 (0.0%):	16-17
0 (0.0%):	18-19
0 (0.0%):	20 or more

6. How often do you attend this course?

3 (10.0%):	Very Rarely
5 (16.7%):	Some of the Time
22 (73.3%):	Most of the Time

## **COURSE MATERIAL ECON 1**

7. The course material is intellectually stimulating.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.3%):	Disagree
2 (6.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
16 (53.3%):	Agree
10 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (3.3%):	Not Applicable

8. Assignments promote learning.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (10.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
18 (60.0%):	Agree
9 (30.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**9. Required reading is useful.**

1 (3.3%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.3%):	Disagree
6 (20.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (40.0%):	Agree
7 (23.3%):	Strongly Agree
3 (10.0%):	Not Applicable

**10. This course is difficult relative to others.**

1 (3.3%):	Strongly Disagree
7 (23.3%):	Disagree
8 (26.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (36.7%):	Agree
3 (10.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**11. Exams are representative of the course material.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (6.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
13 (43.3%):	Agree
15 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**12. Do you recommend this course overall?**

29 (96.7%):	Yes
1 (3.3%):	No

**13. Course ECON 1:**

- I thought that there were times in class where the lecture was a bit fast. I do appreciate the edited PowerPoint slides being posted after class so I can review the material without copy down without sitting through the zoom recording again. Ultimately I think that this was a great introduction to college classes for me!
- I believe this course is really interesting since most of its knowledge can be related to people's life and their own experience.

**14. Exams/Quizzes/Papers:**

- Wording and multiple choice answers can be hard to understand sometimes.
- Because the questions on quizzes were so limited, I wished there was a way to make up lost points. Even with the two lowest quiz grades dropped, I think it would have been more valuable for me if instead I was able to make corrections on the quizzes. A suggestion on that idea is to give back half points for accurate corrected answers to both help students learn and as an incentive to review incorrect answers.
- Exams and quizzes are fine for me, and really test my knowledge of this course

**15. Reading [title(s) and comments]:**

- Readings are all related to the course, and it is not that hard for people to understand

**INSTRUCTOR Katherine Rittenhouse**

**16. Instructor displays a proficient command of the material.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (3.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
10 (33.3%): Agree  
19 (63.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**17. Instructor is well prepared for classes.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
12 (40.0%): Agree  
18 (60.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**18. Instructor's speech is clear and audible.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (3.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
13 (43.3%): Agree  
16 (53.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**19. Instructor explains the course material well.**

0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (3.3%): Disagree  
4 (13.3%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
12 (40.0%): Agree  
13 (43.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**20. Lectures hold your attention.**

1 (3.3%): Strongly Disagree  
2 (6.7%): Disagree  
9 (30.0%): Neither Agree nor Disagree  
6 (20.0%): Agree  
12 (40.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

**21. Instructor's lecture style facilitates note-taking.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (10.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (40.0%):	Agree
15 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**22. Instructor shows concern for students' learning.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
3 (10.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (33.3%):	Agree
17 (56.7%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**23. Instructor promotes appropriate questions/discussion.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
2 (6.7%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (40.0%):	Agree
16 (53.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**24. Instructor is accessible outside of class.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
1 (3.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
10 (33.3%):	Agree
19 (63.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

**25. Instructor starts and finishes class on time.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
12 (41.4%):	Agree
17 (58.6%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

**26. Instructor is effective in promoting academic integrity.**

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
9 (31.0%):	Agree
20 (69.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

27. The instructor practiced effective teaching strategies that acknowledged and valued differences among students, including differences of race and gender identity.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (3.3%):	Disagree
1 (3.3%):	Neither Agree nor Disagree
11 (36.7%):	Agree
16 (53.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (3.3%):	Not Applicable

28. Instructor Katherine Rittenhouse:

- The instructor creates a good learning environment with live lectures and materials. They pose questions that make you think about the bigger picture/think critically to get the answer, which helped me solidify my understanding of the concepts. She is also very accomodating to our requests/needs and encourages me to attend lectures/engage with the material more. The course was very enjoyable although I am not an econ major. Thank you so much for this learning experience! :)

- Very kind professor who took the time to explain topics well. I mentioned a microphone issue in the first lecture and by the second lecture, she had gotten a new microphone and drastically improved the class experience. Also understands that not everyone wants to participate in breakout rooms and prefers to work alone. Very knowledgeable in the topic and the semi-daily reflections are very good.

Thank you for everything :D

- Professor Rittenhouse really tries to accommodate all students and values our feedback. She is a great professor overall.
- She is a great teacher who always answers students questions, and she concerns our reflections of the course
- Thank you for all your help throughout this class. Though my questions didn't make since half of the time, you listened and helped me reach a point of understanding on topics I had trouble with.

29. Do you recommend this professor overall?

29 (96.7%):	Yes
1 (3.3%):	No

### Custom Question 5

30. Please provide examples of the ways the instructor did or did not create a learning environment that welcomed, challenged, and supported all students.

- I think her points are clear for me, since I can easily understand the information in class, and whenever I send her an email, she will reply me as soon as possible.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are

made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.

# ECONOMICS 1: MICROECONOMICS, SUMMER 2021

UC San Diego, Summer Session II, 2021  
Instructor: Katherine Rittenhouse  
TAs: Ellen Liaw, Alyssa Brown

## Course Objectives

As the first class in economics, Econ 1 is designed to help you understand why and how individuals and firms interact in market settings. You will learn how the demand for and supply of a product is determined and how equilibrium in a market occurs. You will do a deep dive into how individuals make consumption choices, how firms behave under perfect competition and why perfectly competitive markets lead to efficient outcomes. You will learn about labor markets, and that will help you identify the effects of the minimum wage and the factors contributing to income inequality. Finally, you will learn about international trade and be able to determine the winners and losers from trade.

## Prerequisites

There are no formal prerequisites, but you should be comfortable with (i) reading graphs, (ii) translating verbal problems into equations, and (iii) solving simultaneous equations. If your skills are rusty, I will refer you to online resources to get you up to speed.

## Class Schedule and Contact Information

	<u>Taught by</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Zoom ID</u>	<u>Recorded?</u>
<u>Lecture</u>	Katherine Rittenhouse	TuTh	2-4:50 pm	969 0231 5845	YES
<u>Discussion Section</u>	Ellen Liaw/Alyssa Brown	W	2-3:50 pm	996 4624 2755	YES

If you have any question or concerns, you are welcome to drop by our office hours or send us an email. Here are our office hours:

	<u>Day</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Zoom ID</u>	<u>Recorded?</u>
Katherine Rittenhouse	M	9-10 am	916 4003 6560	NO
Ellen Liaw/Alyssa Brown	Tu	1-2pm	925 7250 8802	NO

Note that there will be additional office hours during exam weeks. If you are in a different time zone and cannot feasibly come to office hours, send us an email to schedule an alternate time. For all course-related questions, please use the course email for the fastest response time:

[economics1su2021@gmail.com](mailto:economics1su2021@gmail.com)

## Supplemental Instruction Study Group

Supplemental Instruction (SI) is an opportunity for students to meet to review course materials and prepare for quizzes and exams as well as share learning and study strategies. You can learn more about the program at [this website](#). Your SI leader is Stephanie Nguyen, who will be leading sessions on **Mondays and Wednesdays from 12-1:20pm** on Zoom (990 0805 0326). For more information see the SI canvas page [here](#).

## Your Grade

Assignment	% of Grade	Notes
Lecture reflections	10%	<p>At the end of each lecture, I will post a short reflection survey that you will have 24 hours (to account for students in other time zones) to submit (via canvas).</p> <p>Lecture Reflections will be graded as follows:</p> <p><b>8/8</b> Thoughtful response that engaged with the content of the lecture</p> <p><b>4/8</b> Cursory responses that meet a minimum standard</p> <p><b>0/8</b> Did not turn anything in</p> <p>There will be 10 Lecture Reflections. <b>Your two lowest scores are automatically dropped.</b></p>
Quizzes	15%	<p>Quizzes will be made available after each lecture (on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 5pm) and due 24 hours later (i.e. on Wednesdays and Fridays at 5pm).</p> <p>There will be 10 quizzes. <b>Your two lowest scores are automatically dropped.</b></p> <p>The first quiz will be a <i>Prerequisite Quiz</i> and it will be due by 2pm on Wednesday of Week 1 (i.e. before discussion section). It will cover material in Appendix 1. The goal of this quiz is to refresh your algebra and graphing skills. You can make up any points you miss on this first quiz by: (1) re-doing the questions you missed and (2) explaining where you went wrong in the original quiz.</p>
Midterm exam	30%	<p>This will be an in-class midterm on Thursday August 19 from <b>2:00 – 3:30pm</b>. Additional notes on remote exam proctoring are included below.</p> <p>The TAs will hold a Midterm Review (Monday August 16 2-4pm; Zoom info on Canvas).</p>
Final exam	45%	<p>The cumulative final exam will be held on <b>Saturday September 4</b> from <b>3:00 – 6:00pm</b>. Additional notes on remote exam proctoring are included below.</p> <p>The TAs will hold a Final Review (date and time TBA).</p>

## Main References

The primary reference for this course is

- [1] Frank, Robert H., Ben S. Bernanke, Kate Antonovics and Ori Heffetz (2018), *Principles of Economics*, 7<sup>th</sup> edition, McGraw-Hill Irwin.

This book is available at the UCSD bookstore for \$105. It comes with the *connect access code* that grants you access to the digital materials that accompany the text, including practice quizzes and guides to the most efficient chapter reading.

An alternative reference is

- [2] Greenlaw, Steven A. and David Shapiro (2018), *Principles of Microeconomics 2e*, OpenStax.

The text is available for free at <https://openstax.org/details/books/principles-microeconomics-2e>. OpenStax is a Rice University platform that provides free, peer-reviewed, openly licensed textbooks for introductory college courses.

It is up to you which book to use for this course. If you are serious about majoring or minoring in economics, you should consider buying [1] with the access code because it will likely be required for Econ 2 and 3. If you decide to make the purchase, make sure that you buy the custom edition offered at the UCSD bookstore. The department of Economics aggressively negotiates with the publisher, and this would be the best book+access code deal on the market.

### *Additional Useful Material:*

- (1) A free online textbook written by Preston McAfee when he was at CalTech is at a level between Econ 1 and 100A: <https://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/dale/ieav21.pdf>
- (2) [Core Econ](#): A helpful web site for learning economic
- (3) [Khan Academy](#): Another helpful source for learning microeconomics

## Problem Sets and Discussion Sections:

There will be four problem sets, consisting of free-response questions. These problem sets will be UNGRADED and are for your practice only. Problem sets will be made available each week after the Tuesday lecture, and will cover materials from both the Tuesday and Thursday lectures that week.

In the discussion sections, the TAs will go through the solutions to these problems and answer any questions that you may have. The discussion section will be recorded. If you have questions regarding a problem set but are not able to attend the discussion section due to time zone constraints, please come to the TA's office hours.

## **Administrative Issues**

(1) If you have a documented disability, please bring your documentation to me as soon as possible so that I can make suitable accommodations for you. If you believe that you have a disability and desire accommodation, please register with the Office for Students with Disabilities

(2) Academic Integrity:

By enrolling in this course, you agree to:

- rely solely on your own work in connection with all assessments, problems, homework and assignments (unless collaboration is expressly permitted);
- complete all tests and assignments on your own, unless collaboration on an assignment is explicitly permitted;
- acknowledge any and all external sources used in your work;
- maintain only one user account;
- not let anyone else use my username and/or password;
- not engage in any activity that would dishonestly improve your results, or improve or hurt the results of others;
- not post answers to problems that are being used to assess learner performance.

Any student who violates UC San Diego's academic integrity policy will earn a failing grade for the course. In addition, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs will impose a disciplinary penalty.

(3) Exam Logistics:

Both exams will take place through Canvas quizzes. They will contain a combination of multiple-choice questions, and free-response questions.

Proctoring will be done via individual Zoom sessions, and you will be required to submit a recording of your test-taking to the course email address. You must show your UCSD STUDENT ID at the midterm and final. More information on self-proctoring protocols will be made available through canvas.

You may only use a pen/pencil and a calculator during exams. Exams are closed book and you may not use any notes.

## Course Calendar

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
<u>Week 1:</u> - comparative advantage (ch. 2/2) - supply and demand (ch. 3/3)	2	3	4	5	6	
<u>Week 2:</u> - elasticity (ch. 4/5) - demand, pt. 1 (ch. 5/6)	9	10	11	12	13	
<u>Week 3:</u> - demand, pt. 2 (ch. 5/6)	16 Midterm review	17	18	19 In-class midterm	20	
<u>Week 4:</u> - perfectly competitive supply (ch. 6/7&8) - efficiency (ch. 7/7&8)	23	24	25	26	27	
<u>Week 5:</u> - international trade (ch. 15/19) - labor market (ch.13/14)	30	31	1	2	3	4 Final exam 3-6 pm
<i>in brackets are references to chapters in books [1]/[2]</i>		<i>Lecture: 2-4:50 pm</i>	<i>Discussion section: 2-3:50 pm</i> <i>Quiz and Lecture Reflection due at 5pm</i>	<i>Lecture: 2-4:50 pm</i>	<i>Quiz and Lecture Reflection due at 5pm</i>	



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**School of Global Policy and Strategy**

GPCO 404 - Market Failures (Cullen, Julie)  
Winter 2022

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 9**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 89**

1. The Instructional Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

3 (37.5%):	Strongly Agree
3 (37.5%):	Agree
1 (12.5%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
1 (12.5%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

2. The Instructional Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

5 (62.5%):	Strongly Agree
2 (25.0%):	Agree
1 (12.5%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable
1:	[No Response]

3. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately in class.

4 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
2 (25.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

4. The Instructional Assistant helped develop my thinking skills on the subject.

4 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
2 (25.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

5. Feedback from the Instructional Assistant on assignments, exams and/or papers was helpful and constructive.

5 (62.5%): Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%): Agree  
1 (12.5%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

6. The Instructional Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

4 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
2 (25.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

7. The Instructional Assistant answered questions clearly and effectively, helping students to make connections among the course readings, assignments, and lectures.

3 (37.5%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (37.5%):      Agree  
2 (25.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
1:                  [No Response]

8. The Instructional Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

3 (37.5%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (37.5%):      Agree  
2 (25.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
1:                  [No Response]

9. The Instructional Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

4 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
4 (50.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
1:                  [No Response]

10. The Instructional Assistant effectively connected the section/lab exercises with the material covered in lecture.

4 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (37.5%):      Agree  
1 (12.5%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable  
1:                  [No Response]

11. In terms of communication skills, did the Instructional Assistant demonstrate any of the following? (check all that apply)

- |             |   |
|-------------|---|
| 6 (100.0%): | No issues                                   |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Too quiet                                   |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Too loud                                    |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Too fast                                    |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Too slow                                    |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Poor grammar and/or English language skills |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Used filler words such as "um"              |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Other (please describe)                     |

12. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 5 (55.6%): | Strongly Agree             |
| 2 (22.2%): | Agree                      |
| 2 (22.2%): | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |

13. Please describe this person's greatest strengths as a Instructional Assistant.

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine knows theory very well and also the math part as well, she explains everything clearly
- Katherine was a great TA - she is always available for office hours and is willing to spend time reviewing the concepts and mathematical process for problem sets. Her review session for the midterm was organized and helpful!

14. Please describe this person's greatest weaknesses as a Instructional Assistant.

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- I did not notice her weaknesses

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- I would love to see her as a TA next quarter.
- There were a few moments during review sessions when it seemed like Katherine's expertise in Economics but non-attendance of lectures interfered with her ability to explain the material as presented in class. Overall, seemed knowledgeable, accessible, and I would recommend to others.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**School of Global Policy and Strategy**

GPCO 404 - Market Failures (Cullen, Julie)  
Winter 2022

**Evaluation Responses**

1. The Instructional Assistant has a good understanding of the subject matter.

Strongly Agree

2. The Instructional Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

Strongly Agree

3. The Instructional Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

Strongly Agree

4. The Instructional Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

Strongly Agree

5. The Instructional Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

Strongly Agree

6. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and accurately, providing constructive feedback to students.

Strongly Agree

7. The Instructional Assistant returned tests and papers in a timely manner.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant presented material in an intellectually stimulating way that gave students deeper insight into the material.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

Strongly Agree

10. What is your overall rating of the Instructional Assistant?

Excellent

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine was a great TA. She handled all of the tasks on time and very competently. She has clear mastery of the material as well.

12. Sources used to complete this evaluation

Regular meetings/feedback sessions

Review of Instructional Assistant grading

Informal evaluations by students

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Spring 2021

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 3**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 49**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

3 (100.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

1 (33.3%):	Yes
2 (66.7%):	No
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

1 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
2 (66.7%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

2 (66.7%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
1 (33.3%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

3 (100.0%):      Yes  
0 (0.0%):      No  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

3 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

3 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

3 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

3 (100.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

3 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

3 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

3 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

3 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

3 (100.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Spring 2021

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- once a week

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

11-15

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine is a truly excellent TA! I am dreading the day she graduates!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**School of Global Policy and Strategy**

GPCO 404 - Market Failures (Cullen, Julie)  
Winter 2021

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 11**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 40**

1. The Instructional Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

6 (54.5%):	Strongly Agree
3 (27.3%):	Agree
2 (18.2%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

2. The Instructional Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

6 (54.5%):	Strongly Agree
4 (36.4%):	Agree
1 (9.1%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately in class.

7 (63.6%):	Strongly Agree
3 (27.3%):	Agree
1 (9.1%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

4. The Instructional Assistant helped develop my thinking skills on the subject.

4 (36.4%): Strongly Agree  
5 (45.5%): Agree  
2 (18.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

5. Feedback from the Instructional Assistant on assignments, exams and/or papers was helpful and constructive.

5 (45.5%): Strongly Agree  
4 (36.4%): Agree  
2 (18.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

5 (45.5%): Strongly Agree  
4 (36.4%): Agree  
1 (9.1%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
1 (9.1%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant answered questions clearly and effectively, helping students to make connections among the course readings, assignments, and lectures.

5 (45.5%): Strongly Agree  
4 (36.4%): Agree  
2 (18.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

8. The Instructional Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

4 (36.4%): Strongly Agree  
6 (54.5%): Agree  
1 (9.1%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

9. The Instructional Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

5 (45.5%): Strongly Agree  
4 (36.4%): Agree  
2 (18.2%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant effectively connected the section/lab exercises with the material covered in lecture.

7 (63.6%): Strongly Agree  
2 (18.2%): Agree  
1 (9.1%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (9.1%): Not Applicable

11. In terms of communication skills, did the Instructional Assistant demonstrate any of the following? (check all that apply)

9 (100.0%): No issues  
0 (0.0%): Too quiet  
0 (0.0%): Too loud  
0 (0.0%): Too fast  
0 (0.0%): Too slow  
0 (0.0%): Poor grammar and/or English language skills  
0 (0.0%): Used filler words such as "um"  
0 (0.0%): Other (please describe)

12. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

7 (63.6%): Strongly Agree  
4 (36.4%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. Please describe this person's greatest strengths as a Instructional Assistant.

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- I found her discussion sections to be incredibly helpful (even though I was not able to attend synchronously). I thought that Katherine's explanation of concepts and patience were great when trying to understand course material.
- Katherine is well-prepared and helps with our understanding of the course material with ease. When discussing material with other students outside of class, it is quite common to hear a classmate express that Katherine is the one who delivered that "a-ha!" moment, or that they would not have been able to do as well on assignments without her guidance.
- Katherine was great! She held discussion sections for the class and helped me understand the math portions of the class clearly. She was also really accessible through email/office hours, and was always willing to help students. If she didn't know something, she would ask the professor and come back with a solid answer. Katherine was really great!

14. Please describe this person's greatest weaknesses as a Instructional Assistant.

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Not really any weaknesses. Some technology issues at the beginning of the quarter, but that is to be expected with virtual learning!

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**School of Global Policy and Strategy**

GPCO 404 - Market Failures (Cullen, Julie)  
Winter 2021

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 5**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 28**

1. The Instructional Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

5 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

2. The Instructional Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

5 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately in class.

5 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

4. The Instructional Assistant helped develop my thinking skills on the subject.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

5. Feedback from the Instructional Assistant on assignments, exams and/or papers was helpful and constructive.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant answered questions clearly and effectively, helping students to make connections among the course readings, assignments, and lectures.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

8. The Instructional Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

9. The Instructional Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant effectively connected the section/lab exercises with the material covered in lecture.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

11. In terms of communication skills, did the Instructional Assistant demonstrate any of the following? (check all that apply)

5 (100.0%): No issues  
0 (0.0%): Too quiet  
0 (0.0%): Too loud  
0 (0.0%): Too fast  
0 (0.0%): Too slow  
0 (0.0%): Poor grammar and/or English language skills  
0 (0.0%): Used filler words such as "um"  
0 (0.0%): Other (please describe)

12. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

4 (80.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (20.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. Please describe this person's greatest strengths as a Instructional Assistant.  
*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

14. Please describe this person's greatest weaknesses as a Instructional Assistant.  
*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?  
*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
School of Global Policy and Strategy**

GPCO 404 - Market Failures (Cullen, Julie)  
Winter 2021

**Evaluation Responses**

1. The Instructional Assistant has a good understanding of the subject matter.

Strongly Agree

2. The Instructional Assistant was well organized and prepared for class.

Strongly Agree

3. The Instructional Assistant was accessible to students outside of class (office hours, e-mail, etc.).

Strongly Agree

4. The Instructional Assistant's explanations were appropriate, being neither too complicated nor too simple.

Strongly Agree

5. The Instructional Assistant consistently arrived at lecture, section/lab, office hours and exams on time.

Strongly Agree

6. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and accurately, providing constructive feedback to students.

Strongly Agree

7. The Instructional Assistant returned tests and papers in a timely manner.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant presented material in an intellectually stimulating way that gave students deeper insight into the material.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant was genuinely interested in and enthusiastic about teaching.

Strongly Agree

10. What is your overall rating of the Instructional Assistant?

Excellent

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine did a tremendous job supporting students' instructional experiences as we all worked remotely. She is very capable and responsible and was able to clearly explain complex material.

12. Sources used to complete this evaluation

Classroom observation

Review of Instructional Assistant grading

Informal evaluations by students

Other (please describe)

- Coordination during weekly lectures.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of School of Global Policy and Strategy, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Fall 2020

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 4**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 90**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

4 (100.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

2 (50.0%):	Yes
2 (50.0%):	No
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

3 (75.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
1 (25.0%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

3 (75.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
1 (25.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

4 (100.0%):      Yes  
0 (0.0%):      No  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

4 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

4 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

4 (100.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

4 (100.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

4 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

3 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable  
1: [No Response]

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

4 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

4 (100.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

4 (100.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Explains topics very clearly, highly recommended!
- Perfect

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Fall 2020

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- once or twice a week via email

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

16-20

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine is a truly excellent TA! I am grateful to have her and will be sad when she has to graduate, as we have taught and TA'ed this class together now a few times!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Bharadwaj, Prashant)  
Summer Session 1 2020

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 4**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 68**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Agree             |
| 2 (50.0%): | Agree                      |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |
| 2 (50.0%): | Not Applicable             |

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

- |            |                |
|------------|----------------|
| 0 (0.0%):  | Yes            |
| 2 (50.0%): | No             |
| 2 (50.0%): | Not Applicable |

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

- |             |                            |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| 0 (0.0%):   | Strongly Agree             |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Agree                      |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):   | Strongly Disagree          |
| 4 (100.0%): | Not Applicable             |

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
4 (100.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

4 (100.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Agree  
4 (100.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

1 (25.0%): Strongly Agree  
3 (75.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

3 (75.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (25.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

0 (0.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
4 (100.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
4 (100.0%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
4 (100.0%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

0 (0.0%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
4 (100.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

2 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (50.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

3 (75.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (25.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- good TA. Thank you for your help in this class.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Bharadwaj, Prashant)  
Summer Session 1 2020

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- Somewhat often

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

6-10

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine was an excellent TA. She worked with me and Alyssa for a class that is not easy to TA given the sensitive nature of the course content (ECON 138). She was thorough in all her work and was a team player. One time I set an unusually hard question for a class discussion, and I got the answer wrong myself (I think Katherine was the only one who solved this question correctly). She was kind about not interrupting me during class to tell me that I was wrong (as that would have confused the students since it took me a while longer to understand her solution to the problem and why it was correct and why I was wrong), but then explained it later. I regard this particular interaction with her as an important anecdote in how she conducts herself in class and around students and faculty. This anecdote showcases to me that ultimately she cares about how concepts and solutions are communicated to students, and not just about "being correct" (which she was!). I would hope she TAs for me again!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Spring 2020

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 4**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 53**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

2 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (50.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

3 (75.0%): Yes  
1 (25.0%): No  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

2 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (50.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

3 (75.0%):      Strongly Agree  
1 (25.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

3 (75.0%):      Yes  
1 (25.0%):      No  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

2 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (50.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

2 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (50.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

3 (75.0%):      Strongly Agree  
1 (25.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

- 1 (25.0%): Yes
- 1 (25.0%): No
- 2 (50.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

- 1 (25.0%): Strongly Agree
- 1 (25.0%): Agree
- 0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
- 2 (50.0%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

- 1 (25.0%): Strongly Agree
- 1 (25.0%): Agree
- 0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
- 2 (50.0%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

- 2 (50.0%): Strongly Agree
- 2 (50.0%): Agree
- 0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

- 2 (50.0%): Strongly Agree
- 2 (50.0%): Agree
- 0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree
- 0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

3 (75.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (25.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Amazing TA! She was reachable outside of her office hours, was very informative when she explained things, and she emailed fast when I had questions. Thank you for all your help this past quarter! (:

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Spring 2020

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- Once a week

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

11-15

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Great job!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Winter 2020

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 6**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 48**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

2 (33.3%):	Strongly Agree
1 (16.7%):	Agree
3 (50.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

1 (16.7%):	Yes
5 (83.3%):	No
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (16.7%):	Agree
2 (33.3%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (50.0%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

3 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
1 (16.7%):      Agree  
1 (16.7%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
1 (16.7%):      Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

6 (100.0%):      Yes  
0 (0.0%):      No  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

2 (33.3%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (50.0%):      Agree  
1 (16.7%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

3 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%):      Agree  
1 (16.7%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

2 (33.3%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (50.0%):      Agree  
1 (16.7%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

3 (50.0%): Yes  
1 (16.7%): No  
2 (33.3%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

2 (33.3%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
1 (16.7%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
3 (50.0%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

1 (16.7%): Strongly Agree  
1 (16.7%): Agree  
1 (16.7%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
3 (50.0%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

2 (33.3%): Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%): Agree  
2 (33.3%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

3 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%): Agree  
1 (16.7%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

3 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
2 (33.3%):	Agree
1 (16.7%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- I have had Kathrine for two quarters as a TA and she is very helpful. She has strong command of the material and had useful answers to my questions very approachable and willing to aid students!
- She had some differences in how she approached the analytical questions to our tests, but still had the correct solutions. Other than that she was very knowledgeable and helpful during the entire quarter.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 151 - Public Economics:Expenditure I (Meckel, Katherine Hunter)  
Winter 2020

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- Weekly

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

6-10

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Great TA!

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (Jacobsen, Mark)  
Fall 2019

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 8**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 245**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

3 (37.5%):	Strongly Agree
2 (25.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (37.5%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

2 (25.0%):	Yes
3 (37.5%):	No
3 (37.5%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

3 (37.5%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
5 (62.5%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

3 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Agree  
3 (50.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
2:                  [No Response]

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

7 (87.5%):      Yes  
1 (12.5%):      No  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

5 (62.5%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%):      Agree  
1 (12.5%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

5 (62.5%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%):      Agree  
1 (12.5%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

6 (75.0%):      Strongly Agree  
2 (25.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

2 (25.0%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
6 (75.0%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

3 (37.5%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
5 (62.5%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

3 (37.5%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
5 (62.5%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

4 (66.7%): Strongly Agree  
0 (0.0%): Agree  
2 (33.3%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
2: [No Response]

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

5 (62.5%): Strongly Agree  
1 (12.5%): Agree  
2 (25.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

5 (62.5%):	Strongly Agree
2 (25.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
1 (12.5%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- I think Katherine is a great TA as she clearly shows understanding of the material. Her discussions were very helpful as she used in class examples but slowed them down and took them step by step to ensure understanding.
- Overall had a great teaching style and took the time to teach students. Always went the extra mile and took her time. Showed she knew the information well and displayed great interest in students successes. One of the best TAs at UCSD would give high praise to this TA as she went the extra mile to always make sure we succeeded

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (Jacobsen, Mark)  
Fall 2019

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- weekly

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

6-10

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 138 - Economics of Discrimination (Bharadwaj, Prashant)  
Spring 2019

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- Very often

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

11-15

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- Katherine is very professional and it is a joy to be able to work with her. I hope she is my TA again in the future.

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 100C - Microeconomics C (Sinitsyn, Maxim)  
Winter 2019

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 6  
Number of Students Enrolled: 85**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
2 (33.3%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
4 (66.7%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

0 (0.0%):	Yes
4 (66.7%):	No
2 (33.3%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

0 (0.0%):	Strongly Agree
0 (0.0%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
6 (100.0%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

1 (16.7%): Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%): Agree  
3 (50.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

5 (83.3%): Yes  
1 (16.7%): No  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

3 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (16.7%): Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

4 (66.7%): Strongly Agree  
1 (16.7%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
1 (16.7%): Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

3 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (33.3%): Agree  
1 (16.7%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

- |            |                |
|------------|----------------|
| 1 (16.7%): | Yes            |
| 3 (50.0%): | No             |
| 2 (33.3%): | Not Applicable |

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Agree             |
| 2 (33.3%): | Agree                      |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |
| 4 (66.7%): | Not Applicable             |

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Agree             |
| 1 (16.7%): | Agree                      |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |
| 5 (83.3%): | Not Applicable             |

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 1 (16.7%): | Strongly Agree             |
| 2 (33.3%): | Agree                      |
| 3 (50.0%): | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

- |            |                            |
|------------|----------------------------|
| 2 (33.3%): | Strongly Agree             |
| 3 (50.0%): | Agree                      |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Neither Agree Nor Disagree |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Disagree                   |
| 0 (0.0%):  | Strongly Disagree          |
| 1 (16.7%): | Not Applicable             |

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

3 (50.0%):	Strongly Agree
2 (33.3%):	Agree
1 (16.7%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- louder voice would be helpful

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Student IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse**  
**Department of Economics**

ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (Jacobsen, Mark)  
Fall 2018

**Number of Evaluations Submitted: 12**  
**Number of Students Enrolled: 298**

1. The Instructional Assistant graded fairly and consistently.

3 (25.0%):	Strongly Agree
1 (8.3%):	Agree
2 (16.7%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
6 (50.0%):	Not Applicable

2. I went to the Instructional Assistant's office hours.

9 (75.0%):	Yes
3 (25.0%):	No
0 (0.0%):	Not Applicable

3. The Instructional Assistant's assistance during office hours was well-informed, clearly presented and valuable.

7 (58.3%):	Strongly Agree
2 (16.7%):	Agree
0 (0.0%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree
3 (25.0%):	Not Applicable

4. In general, material covered during office hours was beneficial and helpful in my overall understanding of the course.

7 (58.3%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (25.0%):      Agree  
2 (16.7%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

5. I went to the Instructional Assistant's discussion sections.

10 (83.3%):      Yes  
1 (8.3%):      No  
1 (8.3%):      Not Applicable

6. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to lead discussion sections.

6 (50.0%):      Strongly Agree  
4 (33.3%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
2 (16.7%):      Not Applicable

7. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at discussion sections.

7 (58.3%):      Strongly Agree  
3 (25.0%):      Agree  
0 (0.0%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree  
2 (16.7%):      Not Applicable

8. In general, discussion sections enhanced my understanding of the course material.

7 (58.3%):      Strongly Agree  
4 (33.3%):      Agree  
1 (8.3%):      Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Disagree  
0 (0.0%):      Strongly Disagree

9. I went to the Instructional Assistant's midterm exam review session(s).

5 (41.7%): Yes  
0 (0.0%): No  
7 (58.3%): Not Applicable

10. The Instructional Assistant came prepared and well organized to exam reviews.

6 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
1 (8.3%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
1 (8.3%): Strongly Disagree  
4 (33.3%): Not Applicable

11. The Instructional Assistant presented course material clearly and answered questions accurately at exam reviews.

6 (50.0%): Strongly Agree  
2 (16.7%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
1 (8.3%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
3 (25.0%): Not Applicable

12. In general, exam reviews enhanced my understanding of the course material.

7 (58.3%): Strongly Agree  
3 (25.0%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
1 (8.3%): Disagree  
1 (8.3%): Strongly Disagree

13. The Instructional Assistant was approachable, courteous and showed interest and concern for students' learning and understanding.

8 (66.7%): Strongly Agree  
4 (33.3%): Agree  
0 (0.0%): Neither Agree Nor Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Strongly Disagree  
0 (0.0%): Not Applicable

14. I would recommend this Instructional Assistant to other students.

8 (66.7%):	Strongly Agree
3 (25.0%):	Agree
1 (8.3%):	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Disagree
0 (0.0%):	Strongly Disagree

15. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

- helpful during homework help session
- She did a great job in leading problem set reviews, and was very helpful in office hours before midterms, she made herself available. Overall easy to understand topics because she gave us good steps and guidelines for approaching each problem in the problem set reviews.
- She was really helpful

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of instructors, Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.



9500 GILMAN DRIVE  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0348

**Instructor IA Evaluation for Katherine P Rittenhouse  
Department of Economics**

ECON 131 - Economics of the Environment (Jacobsen, Mark)  
Fall 2018

**Evaluation Responses**

1. How frequently did you meet with your Instructional Assistant?

- Approx every other week

2. On average, how many hours per week do you think the Instructional Assistant worked?

16-20

3. Does the Instructional Assistant complete requested work on time?

Always

4. Does the Instructional Assistant attend lectures when requested?

Always

5. Does the Instructional Assistant make him/herself available to students through regular office hours?

Always

6. Is the Instructional Assistant a responsible and fair grader?

Always

7. The Instructional Assistant understands the course material.

Strongly Agree

8. The Instructional Assistant is interested in and courteous to students.

Strongly Agree

9. The Instructional Assistant explains the course material well.

Strongly Agree

10. I would request this person as my Instructional Assistant in the future.

Strongly Agree

11. Do you have any other comments to add to your evaluation?

*Please keep your comments constructive and professional, abiding by the Principles of Community*

[No Responses]

Please note that any responses or comments submitted by evaluators do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Economics, Academic Affairs, or UC San Diego. Responses and comments are made available without auditing or editing, and they may not be modified or deleted, to ensure that each evaluator has an opportunity to express his or her opinion.