

## TEACHING STATEMENT

---

### 1 Teaching Experiences

**Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching.** I have been a Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) for a variety of courses. I taught the **Principles of Economics II** (Fall 2017) and **Principles of Economics I** (Winter 2018) with Dr. Adam Stevenson. I further taught **Introduction to Statistics and Econometrics I** (Fall 2018) and **Econometrics for Applied Scientists** (Winter 2020, Master's course) with Dr. Asenka Asenova. My role was to lead two discussion sections per course, which consisted of around 30 students each. I also held office hours and helped with examinations. I was also the Head GSI for **Principles of Economics II** (Winter 2019) with Dr. Ed Cho, where I performed an administrative role in addition to the roles of a GSI.

**Course Assistant.** I have also worked as a Course Assistant for "Causal Inference" (Fall 2021, Ph.D. course) in the School of Information with Prof. Alain Cohn. This role involved designing nine original problem sets with three to four long practice questions on applying methods of causal inference such as instrumental variables, regression discontinuity, and difference-in-differences.

### 2 Teaching Philosophy

I believe that a good understanding of economics stems from an ability to connect basic economic models to real world issues. However, forming these connections requires nuance, and an understanding of the assumptions that drive key results within these models. In my discussions of economic models, even at the introductory level, I am careful to point out the importance of these assumptions. Additionally, I also guide students through the intuition behind the mathematics of economic models to facilitate a more thorough understanding of the concepts at hand, rather than aiming for mere technical clarity. While these types of explanations take time, I proactively adjust my teaching based on the composition of the class because I recognize that my classes consist of students with varied levels of background knowledge. I believe a core strength of my teaching is my ability to break down complex concepts into digestible chunks and adapt to the needs of a class, as highlighted in the comments below:

*"Nishaad Rao was an excellent GSI. He was incredible at explaining main points from lecture, and his problem sets were a great backbone of what to study. He read the class and their reactions well, and was able to adapt to our needs."*

*"Nishaad was patient, helpful, enthusiastic, and a pleasure to have as a teacher. He seems like a natural!"*

Further, I think that my role as a teacher extends beyond the classroom, where students often do not feel comfortable asking questions. I therefore try my best to be available outside the classroom in office hours, where I can engage better with a student's questions. I also try to welcome other questions in office hours that are not strictly coursework related, such as the connection of what we learn in class to the real world, as well

as general advice on a career in economics or research. In fact, I have written letters of recommendation for two of my students for a study abroad program at the London School of Economics. Interacting with these students is rewarding for me, and the comments below show that the students enjoy them as well:

*“Nishaad is one of the best GSI’s I’ve had. He brought a great energy to discussions and livened up a Friday afternoon. He was also very helpful and willing to meet with students outside of lectures and discussions. Nishaad was excellent at breaking down the course material into more digestible segments and clearly explaining how the math fit in the logic of the course. I appreciated his clarity, logical thought processes, and friendly demeanor.”*

*“Rao is the only reason I was able to get through Cho. Truly, U-M is fortunate to have GSIs like Rao.”*

### 3 Teaching Interests

I am well-prepared to teach the classes below based on my research and teaching experiences. I welcome the opportunity to teach courses beyond those on this list.

**Urban Economics (Undergraduate, Graduate).** My working papers focus on the aggregate consequences of local markets, including wealth inequality, housing choice, and migration. Engaging with this literature has allowed me to develop skills that are necessary to analyze regional economies. I can teach an undergraduate or graduate course in urban economics, focusing on local labor markets and place-based policies, including land use, local investments, moving vouchers, etc.

**Macroeconomics and Inequality (Undergraduate, Graduate).** My job market paper and other working papers have a major focus on how inequality can be generated in macroeconomic models. Meanwhile, distributional macroeconomics has become an important aspect of policy and academic work in recent years. I am familiar with the latest developments in continuous time models which have the capacity to generate important distributional consequences of macroeconomic phenomena, and I believe I would be able to introduce these state-of-the-art techniques in a graduate level course. I can teach the basics of how to think about distributional consequences within macro models to undergraduates as well.

**Labor Economics (Undergraduate, Graduate).** My working papers focus on how workers interact with the labor market, and in turn, how labor markets shape the life cycle experiences of households, particularly migration and wealth accumulation. My research agenda also includes topics in intergenerational wealth mobility and occupational mobility. These topics allow me to teach a course in labor economics focusing on intergenerational mobility, urban economics, migration, human capital accumulation, discrimination, and related topics.

**Applied Econometrics (Undergraduate).** Finally, my papers use various methods in applied econometrics, such as event study analyses, difference-in-differences, instrumental variables, etc. Additionally, I have also taught various courses at the undergraduate and Masters level on econometrics, and have designed problem sets for a Ph.D. level course as well. Leveraging these skills, I can teach an undergraduate level course in applied econometric techniques.

## 4 Teaching Evaluation Averages

Below are averages for some selected questions that are asked to students on teaching evaluations. These are scored out of 5. I have also attached the full reports of all my course evaluations to the statement as well.

	<b>Fall 2017</b>		<b>Winter 2018</b>		<b>Fall 2018</b>		<b>Winter 2019</b>	<b>Winter 2021</b>		
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Avg</b>
Overall, the instructor:										
was an excellent teacher	4.83	4.7	4.81	4.29	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.7	4.7
was well prepared	4.83	4.93	4.71	4.14	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7
explained material clearly	4.83	4.93	4.81	4	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.7
handled questions well	4.83	5	4.71	4.25	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
willing to meet outside class	4.83	4.93	4.81	4	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.9	4.3	4.6
Number of respondents	8/34	9/31	11/34	13/33	12/36	9/36	21/32	9/18	5/14	92/268



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

## Fall 2017 Final

8 students responded out of the total enrolled 34

## Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas  
ECON 102 204

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*					
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	University Wide			School/College		
								75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	3.70	4.17	4.63	3.88	4.11	4.40
891 As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier).	2	1	4	1	0	0	3.25	2.80	3.10	3.40			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.17	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	5	1	2	0	0	0	4.70	3.75	4.17	4.63			
1633 I knew what was expected of me in this course. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever).	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.36	4.68			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.53	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.25	4.67	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.70	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	3.88	4.30	4.70	3.83	4.17	4.50
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.17	4.63	4.83
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	4	2	1	1	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.00	4.20	4.50
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	4	2	1	1	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.33	4.67			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	4	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.63			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	3.80	4.13	4.60			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	4	2	1	0	0	1	4.63	4.60	4.78	4.90			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.20	4.64	4.86			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.50	4.82	4.93			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.00	4.50	4.76			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	4.10	4.60	4.83			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.39	4.75	4.91			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.50	4.79	4.90			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	4	2	1	0	0	0	4.63	4.33	4.67	4.83			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.25	4.59	4.80			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	2	3	1	1	0	1	4.00	3.66	4.00	4.50			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	4	2	1	0	0	1	4.63	4.00	4.50	4.75			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	1	3	1	2	1	0	3.50	3.19	3.93	4.38			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	6	1	1	0	0	0	4.83	4.00	4.43	4.70			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.08	4.35	4.67			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	4	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	3.86	4.17	4.55			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	3	1	3	1	0	0	3.50	3.83	4.20	4.50			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.42	4.70			
370 I attended class regularly.	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	4.67	4.83	4.92			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.50			

Date Printed: 10/18/2022 20:27:34 PM

Page 1 of 2



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
[ro.umich.edu/evals/](http://ro.umich.edu/evals/)

### Fall 2017 Final

8 students responded out of the total enrolled 34

## Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

**Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas**  
**ECON 102 204**

### Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1  
NA

Student 2  
NA

Student 3  
NA

Student 4  
NA

Student 5  
NA

Student 6  
NA

Student 7  
NA

Student 8  
very good GSI

\* The quartiles are calculated from Fall 2017 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on lower division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

\*\* SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

## Fall 2017 Final

9 students responded out of the total enrolled 31

## Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas  
ECON 102 205

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*					
								University Wide			School/College		
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	4	2	1	0	1	0	4.50	3.70	4.17	4.63	3.88	4.11	4.40
891 As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier).	1	0	3	3	0	1	2.67	2.80	3.10	3.40			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	5	2	1	0	0	0	4.70	4.10	4.42	4.73			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	4	2	1	0	1	0	4.50	3.75	4.17	4.63			
1633 I knew what was expected of me in this course. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever).	3	3	1	1	0	0	4.17	4.00	4.36	4.68			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	7	1	0	0	0	1	4.93	4.53	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	7	1	0	0	0	1	4.93	4.25	4.67	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	4.70	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	2	4	2	0	0	0	4.00	3.88	4.30	4.70	3.83	4.17	4.50
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	5	3	0	0	0	1	4.70	4.33	4.75	4.90	4.17	4.63	4.83
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.38	4.70	4.00	4.20	4.50
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	4	3	1	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.33	4.67			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	4	2	2	0	0	0	4.50	4.00	4.25	4.63			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	2	1	4	0	1	0	3.25	3.80	4.13	4.60			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	6	1	0	0	0	2	4.92	4.60	4.78	4.90			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	4.20	4.64	4.86			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	6	2	0	0	0	1	4.83	4.50	4.82	4.93			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	6	1	0	0	0	2	4.92	4.00	4.50	4.76			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	6	1	1	0	0	1	4.83	4.10	4.60	4.83			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	5	2	1	0	0	1	4.70	4.39	4.75	4.91			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	7	0	1	0	0	1	4.93	4.50	4.79	4.90			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	2	5	1	0	0	0	4.10	4.33	4.67	4.83			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	5	1	1	1	0	1	4.70	4.25	4.59	4.80			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	2	1	4	0	1	0	3.25	3.66	4.00	4.50			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	1	4	3	0	0	0	3.75	4.00	4.50	4.75			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	2	2	2	1	1	0	3.50	3.19	3.93	4.38			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	4	2	1	0	0	1	4.63	4.00	4.43	4.70			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	3	2	2	0	0	1	4.25	4.08	4.35	4.67			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	2	2	2	1	0	1	3.75	3.86	4.17	4.55			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	3	2	1	1	1	0	4.00	3.83	4.20	4.50			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	3	1	2	1	1	0	3.50	4.00	4.42	4.70			
370 I attended class regularly.	6	1	0	1	0	0	4.83	4.67	4.83	4.92			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	3	4	1	0	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.25	4.50			

Date Printed: 11/5/2022 20:16:13 PM

Page 1 of 2



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

### Fall 2017 Final

9 students responded out of the total enrolled 31

## Instructor with Comments Report

2017-11-30 - 2017-12-13 Report ID: MSR04734

**Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas**  
**ECON 102 205**

### Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1

*The instruction was vague at times as to what students would be tested on.*

Student 2

NA

Student 3

*Very good review of lecture and great practice problems*

Student 4

NA

Student 5

NA

Student 6

NA

Student 7

NA

Student 8

*The grading in the course is impossible to know where or how you stand and the first exam was so difficult and I was not taught or explained how to prepare or do well.*

Student 9

NA

\* The quartiles are calculated from Fall 2017 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on lower division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

\*\* SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

## Winter 2018 Final

11 students responded out of the total enrolled 34

## Instructor with Comments Report

2018-04-04 - 2018-04-18 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas  
ECON 101 105

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*					
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	University Wide			School/College		
								75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	4	2	3	1	0	0	4.00	3.67	4.17	4.67	3.75	4.10	4.38
891 As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier).	4	2	4	0	0	0	4.00	2.83	3.12	3.46			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	5	5	0	0	0	0	4.50	4.12	4.50	4.75			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	3	5	2	0	0	0	4.10	3.79	4.25	4.67			
1633 I knew what was expected of me in this course. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever).	6	2	1	1	0	0	4.67	4.02	4.40	4.71			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	7	4	0	0	0	0	4.71	4.52	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	8	1	2	0	0	0	4.81	4.30	4.70	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	8	2	1	0	0	0	4.81	4.68	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	3	4	3	0	0	0	4.00	3.90	4.33	4.75	3.88	4.17	4.56
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	8	0	2	1	0	0	4.81	4.38	4.75	4.92	4.17	4.66	4.86
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	3	5	1	1	0	0	4.10	4.00	4.40	4.75	4.00	4.25	4.60
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	4	4	1	1	0	0	4.25	4.00	4.33	4.63			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	3	5	1	1	0	0	4.10	4.00	4.29	4.64			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	2	3	3	1	0	1	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.50			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	7	2	1	0	0	1	4.79	4.50	4.75	4.89			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	7	4	0	0	0	0	4.71	4.19	4.68	4.88			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	7	1	1	2	0	0	4.71	4.49	4.83	4.94			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	9	1	1	0	0	0	4.89	4.11	4.50	4.77			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	7	1	2	1	0	0	4.71	4.20	4.63	4.83			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	7	2	1	1	0	0	4.71	4.39	4.77	4.92			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	8	2	0	1	0	0	4.81	4.50	4.79	4.92			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	3	5	2	0	0	0	4.10	4.25	4.58	4.81			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	4	4	2	0	0	0	4.25	4.07	4.35	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	6	2	2	1	0	0	4.58	4.33	4.67	4.83			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	3	1	4	1	0	1	3.38	3.61	4.00	4.50			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	3	3	1	1	0	2	4.17	3.91	4.17	4.60			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	4	3	0	1	0	2	4.50	3.28	4.00	4.50			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	3	3	0	0	0	4	4.50	4.06	4.38	4.67			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	3	5	0	0	0	2	4.30	4.10	4.36	4.69			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	2	5	0	1	0	2	4.10	3.80	4.13	4.50			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	3	3	1	1	0	2	4.17	3.78	4.00	4.33			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	3	5	0	1	0	1	4.20	4.00	4.42	4.70			
370 I attended class regularly.	6	3	0	1	0	0	4.67	4.59	4.79	4.91			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	3	3	4	0	0	0	3.83	3.99	4.21	4.55			

Date Printed: 10/18/2022 20:28:38 PM

Page 1 of 2





University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
[ro.umich.edu/evals/](http://ro.umich.edu/evals/)

### Winter 2018 Final

11 students responded out of the total enrolled 34

## Instructor with Comments Report

2018-04-04 - 2018-04-18 Report ID: MSR04734

**Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas**  
**ECON 101 105**

### Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1  
NA

Student 2  
NA

Student 3  
NA

Student 4  
NA

Student 5  
NA

Student 6  
NA

Student 7  
*excellent*

Student 8  
*great*

Student 9  
*Nishaad had a strong, business-like approach to discussion. We got right work explaining course material and working through problems with little time wasted. I love the efficiency. Discussion would be more efficient however if, instead of passing out grading homework assignments one by one, left them in a large stack for students to find their own assignment.*

Student 10  
*Stevenson was a GREAT professor. He was passionate about the material and explained things very well.*

Student 11  
NA

\* The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2018 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on lower division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

\*\* SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

## Winter 2018 Final

13 students responded out of the total enrolled 33

## Instructor with Comments Report

2018-04-04 - 2018-04-18 Report ID: MSR04734

Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas  
ECON 101 103

	Responses from your Students**							Other Users of This Item*					
	5 SA	4 A	3 N	2 D	1 SD	NA	Your Median	University Wide			School/College		
								75% Above	50% Above	25% Above	75% Above	50% Above	25% Above
4 I had a strong desire to take this course.	2	3	6	1	1	0	3.25	3.67	4.17	4.67	3.75	4.10	4.38
891 As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier).	2	4	6	0	0	0	3.50	2.83	3.12	3.46			
1631 This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	2	7	2	1	0	0	3.93	4.12	4.50	4.75			
1632 My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	3	4	4	0	1	0	3.75	3.79	4.25	4.67			
1633 I knew what was expected of me in this course. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever).	5	7	1	0	0	0	4.29	4.02	4.40	4.71			
230 The instructor seemed well prepared for class meetings. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	5	7	1	0	0	0	4.29	4.52	4.81	4.93			
199 The instructor explained material clearly. (SA=Almost Always, A=Frequently, N=Sometimes, D=Occasionally, SD=Hardly Ever)	4	7	2	0	0	0	4.14	4.30	4.70	4.88			
217 The instructor treated students with respect.	7	5	1	0	0	0	4.57	4.68	4.87	4.95			
1 Overall, this was an excellent course.	3	6	2	1	1	0	3.92	3.90	4.33	4.75	3.88	4.17	4.56
2 Overall, the instructor was an excellent teacher.	3	7	1	2	0	0	4.00	4.38	4.75	4.92	4.17	4.66	4.86
3 I learned a great deal from this course.	3	7	1	1	1	0	4.00	4.00	4.40	4.75	4.00	4.25	4.60
120 I learned a good deal of factual material in this course.	3	6	3	1	0	0	3.92	4.00	4.33	4.63			
121 I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	3	7	3	0	0	0	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.64			
143 I was stimulated to discuss related topics outside of class.	2	4	2	4	1	0	3.25	3.67	4.00	4.50			
185 The instructor was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom.	2	7	0	0	0	4	4.14	4.50	4.75	4.89			
200 The instructor handled questions well.	5	6	2	0	0	0	4.25	4.19	4.68	4.88			
206 The instructor seemed to enjoy teaching.	3	6	3	1	0	0	3.92	4.49	4.83	4.94			
209 The instructor was not confused by unexpected questions.	3	7	3	0	0	0	4.00	4.11	4.50	4.77			
210 The instructor was skillful in observing student reactions.	2	8	3	0	0	0	3.94	4.20	4.63	4.83			
215 The instructor maintained an atmosphere of good feeling in class.	2	8	3	0	0	0	3.94	4.39	4.77	4.92			
219 The instructor was willing to meet and help students outside class.	2	9	2	0	0	0	4.00	4.50	4.79	4.92			
223 Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions.	4	8	0	0	1	0	4.19	4.25	4.58	4.81			
231 The objectives of the course were clearly explained.	4	7	1	0	1	0	4.14	4.07	4.35	4.67			
241 The instructor set high standards for students.	2	6	5	0	0	0	3.75	4.33	4.67	4.83			
327 Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating.	1	4	5	1	1	1	3.30	3.61	4.00	4.50			
330 Reading assignments were relevant to what was presented in class.	1	6	5	0	0	1	3.67	3.91	4.17	4.60			
340 The textbook made a valuable contribution to the course.	2	4	2	2	2	1	3.50	3.28	4.00	4.50			
350 Slides/overhead transparencies were a valuable part of this course.	2	5	2	0	1	3	3.90	4.06	4.38	4.67			
356 Examinations covered the important aspects of the course.	3	7	2	0	0	1	4.07	4.10	4.36	4.69			
360 Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty.	3	6	3	0	0	1	4.00	3.80	4.13	4.50			
364 The test items were adequately explained after a test was given.	2	9	1	0	0	1	4.06	3.78	4.00	4.33			
366 The grading system was clearly explained.	3	8	0	1	0	1	4.13	4.00	4.42	4.70			
370 I attended class regularly.	3	5	2	2	1	0	3.80	4.59	4.79	4.91			
371 I utilized all the learning opportunities provided in this course.	2	5	4	1	1	0	3.60	3.99	4.21	4.55			

Date Printed: 11/5/2022 20:22:11 PM

Page 1 of 2



University of Michigan  
Office of the Registrar - Evaluations  
ro.umich.edu/evals/

## Winter 2018 Final

13 students responded out of the total enrolled 33

## Instructor with Comments Report

2018-04-04 - 2018-04-18 Report ID: MSR04734

**Instructor: Rao,Nishaad Shrinivas**  
**ECON 101 103**

### Written Comments

900 Comment on the quality of instruction in this course.

Student 1  
NA

Student 2  
*The instructor was very helpful and good at going through examples.*

Student 3  
NA

Student 4  
NA

Student 5  
*Good*

Student 6  
*good*

Student 7  
*Discussion seemed kind of pointless for this class. I would have liked more review of lecture material rather than going over homework answers.*

Student 8  
*Well-taught discussion.*

Student 9  
NA

Student 10  
NA

Student 11  
*I felt like there was a large separation between what was discussed in lecture and what was expected on homework and exams*

Student 12  
NA

Student 13  
*-Every discussion section that I attended advanced my learning and understanding of the material*

\* The quartiles are calculated from Winter 2018 data. The university-wide quartiles are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college quartiles in this report are based on lower division classes with an enrollment of 16 to 74 students in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

\*\* SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, N - Neutral, D - Disagree, SD - Strongly Disagree, NA - Not Applicable.

Date Printed: 11/5/2022 20:22:11 PM

Page 2 of 2



# Fall 2018 Instructor Report With Comments for ECON 251-204: Intr Stat&Metric II (Nishaad Rao)

Project Title: **Central Campus Fall 2018 Evaluation**

Course Audience: **36**

Responses Received: **9**

Response Ratio: **25.0%**

---

## Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of the report. Ratings are from the Fall 2018 teaching evaluations of ECON 251-204: Intr Stat&Metric II.

---

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Fri, Jan 04, 2019**

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	3	5	0	1	0	0	4.2	4.5	4.4
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	1	5	2	1	0	0	3.8	4.1	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.	3	5	0	1	0	0	4.2	4.4	4.4
Overall, this was an excellent course.	2	6	0	1	0	0	4.1	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.	0	5	2	2	0	0	3.6	4.0	3.9
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	0	1	7	1	0	0	3.0	3.0	3.2

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Nishaad Rao was an excellent teacher.	6	2	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.5	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed well prepared for class meetings.	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.8	4.7
Nishaad Rao explained material clearly.	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.6	4.6
Nishaad Rao treated students with respect.	6	3	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.8	4.8

## Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions. (Q223)	5	4	0	0	0	0	4.6	4.6
Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q327)	0	4	2	1	0	2	3.6	3.9
Examinations covered the important aspects of the course. (Q356)	4	4	0	0	1	0	4.4	4.3
Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty. (Q360)	4	4	0	0	1	0	4.4	4.0
The test items were adequately explained after a test was given. (Q364)	4	4	0	0	1	0	4.4	3.9

## Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Nishaad Rao was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom. (Q185)	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.6
Nishaad Rao handled questions well. (Q200)	6	2	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed to enjoy teaching. (Q206)	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.7
Nishaad Rao was skillful in observing student reactions. (Q210)	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.5
Nishaad Rao was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	6	2	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.7
Nishaad Rao set high standards for students. (Q241)	2	5	2	0	0	0	4.0	4.4

The medians are calculated from Fall 2018 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

## Written Comments

### Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Nishaad was a great GSI for a course I wasn't all that interested in.
Nishaad Rao was a wonderful GSI. He is very understanding, an enthusiastic instructor, and is always very attentive while teaching



# Fall 2018 Instructor Report With Comments for ECON 251-201: Intr Stat&Metric II (Nishaad Rao)

Project Title: **Central Campus Fall 2018 Evaluation**

Course Audience: **36**

Responses Received: **12**

Response Ratio: **33.3%**

---

## Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of the report. Ratings are from the Fall 2018 teaching evaluations of ECON 251-201: Intr Stat&Metric II.

---

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Fri, Jan 04, 2019**

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter.	7	4	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.5	4.4
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.	1	6	4	1	0	0	3.7	4.1	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.	7	3	1	1	0	0	4.6	4.4	4.4
Overall, this was an excellent course.	4	5	2	1	0	0	4.1	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.	1	1	5	5	0	0	2.7	4.0	3.9
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	1	2	9	0	0	0	3.2	3.0	3.2

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Nishaad Rao was an excellent teacher.	7	3	2	0	0	0	4.6	4.5	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed well prepared for class meetings.	8	3	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.8	4.7
Nishaad Rao explained material clearly.	8	3	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.6	4.6
Nishaad Rao treated students with respect.	7	4	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.8	4.8

## Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions. (Q223)	6	5	1	0	0	0	4.5	4.6
Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q327)	0	4	1	1	0	6	3.8	3.9
Examinations covered the important aspects of the course. (Q356)	5	5	1	0	0	1	4.4	4.3
Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty. (Q360)	5	4	2	0	0	1	4.4	4.0
The test items were adequately explained after a test was given. (Q364)	4	5	3	0	0	0	4.1	3.9

## Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Nishaad Rao was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom. (Q185)	5	4	1	0	0	2	4.5	4.6
Nishaad Rao handled questions well. (Q200)	8	3	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed to enjoy teaching. (Q206)	5	6	1	0	0	0	4.3	4.7
Nishaad Rao was skillful in observing student reactions. (Q210)	5	5	1	0	0	0	4.4	4.5
Nishaad Rao was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	6	4	1	0	0	1	4.6	4.7
Nishaad Rao set high standards for students. (Q241)	4	5	3	0	0	0	4.1	4.4



The medians are calculated from Fall 2018 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

Written Comments

Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Nishaad is one of the best GSI's I've had. He brought a great energy to discussions and livened up a Friday afternoon. He was also very helpful and willing to meet with students outside of lectures and discussions. Nishaad was excellent at breaking down the course material into more digestible segments and clearly explaining how the math fit in the logic of the course. I appreciated his clarity, logical thought processes, and friendly demeanor.
Did a great job in furthering understanding of course content and handled questions very well.
Nishaad's teaching really helped me do well in the course!
Nishaad was very helpful during discussion by being clear and concise. He also was receptive to questions during office hours.
Nishaad did a very good job of both keeping the class as engaging as possible and explaining the material thoroughly.



# Winter 2019 Instructor Report With Comments of ECON 102-101: Principle Econ II for Nishaad Rao

Project Title: **Winter 2019 Teaching Evaluation**

Course Audience: **32**

Responses Received: **21**

Response Ratio: **65.6%**

---

## Report Comments

This report is a summary that tabulates all quantitative ratings on a single page. Results from the open-ended questions appear at the end of this report. Ratings are from the Winter 2019 teaching evaluations of ECON 102-101: Principle Econ II.

---

Prepared by: **Office of the Registrar**

Creation Date: **Monday, May 6, 2019**

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. (Q1631)	10	10	0	0	0	0	4.5	4.5	4.4
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course.(Q1632)	7	8	3	1	0	0	4.2	4.2	4.1
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	6	12	1	0	0	0	4.2	4.5	4.5
Overall, this was an excellent course.(Q1)	9	8	3	0	0	0	4.4	4.2	4.2
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	4	8	6	0	0	1	3.9	4.0	3.9
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was... (SA=Much Lighter to SD=Much Heavier)	2	8	5	4	1	0	3.5	3.0	3.2

## Responses to the University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Nishaad Rao was an excellent teacher.	13	6	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.5	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed well prepared for class meetings.	17	2	1	0	0	0	4.9	4.8	4.8
Nishaad Rao explained material clearly.	14	5	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.6	4.6
Nishaad Rao treated students with respect.	17	3	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.8	4.8

## Responses to additional questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions. (Q223)	15	3	1	0	0	1	4.9	4.6
Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q327)	4	6	5	1	0	3	3.8	3.6
Examinations covered the important aspects of the course. (Q356)	7	6	4	0	0	3	4.3	4.3
Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty. (Q360)	5	3	2	5	2	3	3.3	4.0
The test items were adequately explained after a test was given. (Q364)	6	5	3	1	3	2	3.9	3.8

## Responses to additional questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Nishaad Rao was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom. (Q185)	13	2	4	0	0	1	4.8	4.6
Nishaad Rao handled questions well. (Q200)	12	7	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.5
Nishaad Rao seemed to enjoy teaching. (Q206)	9	9	2	0	0	0	4.4	4.6
Nishaad Rao was skillful in observing student reactions. (Q210)	14	5	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.4
Nishaad Rao was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	15	4	1	0	0	0	4.8	4.7
Nishaad Rao set high standards for students. (Q241)	8	10	2	0	0	0	4.3	4.4

The medians are calculated from Winter 2019 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are lower division with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

## Written Comments

### Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)

Comments
Nishaad Rao was an excellent GSI. He was incredible at explaining main points from lecture, and his problem sets were a great backbone of what to study. He read the class and their reactions well, and was able to adapt to our needs
Nishaad Rao was a good GSI. He covered the problem set samples very well and was good with narrowing in on the concepts covered in the exam.
Really good GSI.
Overall, the quality was very good.
Nishaad Rao was great
Nishaad, you were an amazing GSI. The slowed down and thorough explanations you gave about in-lecture topics were super helpful.
Nishaad was helpful in person but did not answer emails which made communication difficult.
Rao is the only reason I was able to get through Cho. Truly, U-M is fortunate to have GSIs like Rao.
Discussion section made a lot of the complex concepts easier for me to understand.
good
The instruction for this course was very thorough. The theories were all explained with several examples and discussed until students all understood it

# University of Michigan

## Winter 2021 Instructor Report With Comments

### ECON 504-003: Econometr MAE II

#### Nishaad Rao

9 out of 18 students responded to this evaluation.

#### Responses to University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. (Q1631)	8	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.6	4.8
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. (Q1632)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.3	4.5
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.6	4.8
Overall, this was an excellent course.(Q1)	8	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.4	4.7
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	6	3	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.1	4.5
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier). (Q891)	0	0	6	3	0	0	2.8	2.9	2.8
How did you participate in this course? (SA=Attended most synchronously, A=Attended most asynchronously, N=Attended most in person, D=Attended some in person and some online) (Q1854)	2	6	0	0	0	0	4.2	4.8	4.8

#### Responses to University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Nishaad Rao was an excellent teacher.(Q2)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.7	4.8
Nishaad Rao seemed well prepared for class meetings.(Q230)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.8	4.9
Nishaad Rao explained material clearly.(Q199)	8	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.7	4.8
Nishaad Rao treated students with respect.(Q217)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.9	4.9

#### Responses to questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions. (Q223)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.7
Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q327)	6	3	0	0	0	0	4.8	4.1
Examinations covered the important aspects of the course. (Q356)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.5
Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty. (Q360)	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.2
The test items were adequately explained after a test was given. (Q364)	7	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.1

## Responses to questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Nishaad Rao was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom. (Q185)	7	1	0	1	0	0	4.9	4.8
Nishaad Rao handled questions well. (Q200)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.7
Nishaad Rao seemed to enjoy teaching. (Q206)	8	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.7
Nishaad Rao was skillful in observing student reactions. (Q210)	7	2	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.6
Nishaad Rao was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	8	1	0	0	0	0	4.9	4.8
Nishaad Rao set high standards for students. (Q241)	5	3	1	0	0	0	4.6	4.6

The medians are calculated from Winter 2021 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are graduate level with enrollment of 16 to 74 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

## Written Comments

**How did the teaching techniques (e.g., certain technologies used, specific approaches to testing and assignments, asynchronous or synchronous teaching methods, instructor flexibility, class interaction, small group work, other teaching methods) of this course serve the aims of this course/ or serve your learning in this course? (Q1872)**

### Comments

The instructor always makes sure that students understand and is willing to help both in class and office hours.

**Given your experience in this course, what teaching techniques do you think the instructor should continue to use in the future (e.g., certain technologies used, specific approaches to testing and assignments, other testing methods, asynchronous or synchronous teaching methods, instructor flexibility, class interaction, small group work, other teaching methods)? (Q1873)**

### Comments

The assignments should continue to help students understand and get some better ideas how to apply knowledge in real-life work.

**Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)**

### Comments

The overall experience is great and helps improve my knowledge about econometrics really well.

# University of Michigan

## Winter 2021 Instructor Report With Comments

### ECON 504-002: Econometr MAE II

#### Nishaad Rao

5 out of 14 students responded to this evaluation.

#### Responses to University-wide questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
This course advanced my understanding of the subject matter. (Q1631)	3	0	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.6	4.8
My interest in the subject has increased because of this course. (Q1632)	3	0	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.3	4.7
I knew what was expected of me in this course.(Q1633)	3	0	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.6	4.8
Overall, this was an excellent course.(Q1)	3	0	2	0	0	0	4.7	4.4	4.8
I had a strong desire to take this course.(Q4)	2	1	2	0	0	0	4.0	4.1	4.7
As compared with other courses of equal credit, the workload for this course was (SA=Much Lighter, A=Lighter, N=Typical, D=Heavier, SD=Much Heavier). (Q891)	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.3	2.9	2.9
How did you participate in this course? (SA=Attended most synchronously, A=Attended most asynchronously, N=Attended most in person, D=Attended some in person and some online) (Q1854)	1	4	0	0	0	0	4.1	4.8	5.0

#### Responses to University-wide questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	Univ-wide Median	School/College Median
Overall, Nishaad Rao was an excellent teacher.(Q2)	3	2	0	0	0	0	4.7	4.7	4.8
Nishaad Rao seemed well prepared for class meetings.(Q230)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.8	4.9
Nishaad Rao explained material clearly.(Q199)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.7	4.9
Nishaad Rao treated students with respect.(Q217)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.9	4.9

#### Responses to questions about the course:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Students in this course were free to disagree and ask questions. (Q223)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.7
Reading assignments were interesting and stimulating. (Q327)	1	1	1	0	0	2	4.0	4.1
Examinations covered the important aspects of the course. (Q356)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3	4.5
Exams were reasonable in length and difficulty. (Q360)	2	1	1	1	0	0	4.0	4.2
The test items were adequately explained after a test was given. (Q364)	2	1	2	0	0	0	4.0	4.1

## Responses to questions about the instructor:

	SA	A	N	D	SD	N/A	Your Median	University-Wide Median
Nishaad Rao was sensitive to multicultural issues in the classroom. (Q185)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.8
Nishaad Rao handled questions well. (Q200)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.7
Nishaad Rao seemed to enjoy teaching. (Q206)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.7
Nishaad Rao was skillful in observing student reactions. (Q210)	3	1	1	0	0	0	4.7	4.6
Nishaad Rao was willing to meet and help students outside class. (Q219)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3	4.8
Nishaad Rao set high standards for students. (Q241)	2	2	1	0	0	0	4.3	4.6

The medians are calculated from Winter 2021 data. University-wide medians are based on all UM classes in which an item was used. The school/college medians in this report are based on classes that are graduate level with enrollment of 1 to 15 in Division of Social Sciences in the College of LS&A.

## Written Comments

**How did the teaching techniques (e.g., certain technologies used, specific approaches to testing and assignments, asynchronous or synchronous teaching methods, instructor flexibility, class interaction, small group work, other teaching methods) of this course serve the aims of this course/ or serve your learning in this course? (Q1872)**

Comments
Ok
The format and execution of sections was extremely clear, helpful, and relevant.

**Given your experience in this course, what teaching techniques do you think the instructor should continue to use in the future (e.g., certain technologies used, specific approaches to testing and assignments, other testing methods, asynchronous or synchronous teaching methods, instructor flexibility, class interaction, small group work, other teaching methods)? (Q1873)**

Comments
Ok
Overall, course office hours were plentiful enough. But I believe Nishaad's were put during Econ 502 lecture. I didn't say anything, so I can't complain, but maybe the courses could communicate more.

**Comment on the quality of instruction in this course. (Q900)**

Comments
Nishaad was patient, helpful, enthusiastic, and a pleasure to have as a teacher. He seems like a natural!