COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2021 (COVID)

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

ECON 200 AJ
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Online

Taught by: Lukas Hager
Instructor Evaluated: Lukas Hager-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 7/47 (15% low)

Overall Summative Rating represents the combined responses of students to the four global summative items and is presented to provide an overall index of the class's quality:

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	**4.7**

(0=lowest; 5=highest)

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI) combines student responses to several *IASystem* items relating to how academically challenging students found the course to be and how engaged they were:

CEI: 4.8
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The remote learning course as a whole was:	7	43%	29%		29%			4.2	4.4
The course content was:	7	43%	29%	14%	14%			4.2	4.3
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	7	57%	29%	14%				4.6	4.7
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8	4.9

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Relative to other college courses you have taken:	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	7	14%		43%	29%	14%			4.7
The intellectual challenge presented was:	7	14%	43%	14%	29%				5.7
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	7		43%	43%	14%				5.3
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	7	14%	29%	29%	29%				5.2
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your participation in this course was:	7	14%	14%	43%	29%				5.0
Relative to similar courses taught in person, your success in this course was:	7		29%	29%	29%	14%			4.8

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?   **Class median: 6.2 (N=7)**

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
		29%	57%	14%							

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?   **Class median: 4.8 (N=7)**

Under 2	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12-13	14-15	16-17	18-19	20-21	22 or more
14%		57%	14%	14%							

What grade do you expect in this course?   **Class median: 3.3 (N=7)**

A (3.9-4.0)	A- (3.5-3.8)	B+ (3.2-3.4)	B (2.9-3.1)	B- (2.5-2.8)	C+ (2.2-2.4)	C (1.9-2.1)	C- (1.5-1.8)	D+ (1.2-1.4)	D (0.9-1.1)	D- (0.7-0.8)	F (0.0)	Pass	Credit	No Credit
	43%	14%	29%		14%									

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=7)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
29%	14%	43%			14%

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2021 (COVID)

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
The effectiveness of this remote course in facilitating my learning was:	7	43%	29%		29%			4.2	9
Timeliness of instructor response to assignments was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	3
Quality/helpfulness of instructor feedback was:	7	71%	29%					4.8	5
Clarity of course objectives was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6	6
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8	2
Usefulness of reading assignments in understanding course content was:	7	57%		43%				4.6	4
Usefulness of written assignments in understanding course content was:	6	50%	17%	17%	17%			4.5	10
Usefulness of online resources in understanding course content was:	7	57%	14%	29%				4.6	7
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	7	43%	29%	29%				4.2	11
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	7	71%	14%	14%				4.8	1
Organization of materials online was:	7	57%	29%		14%			4.6	8

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2021 (COVID)

ECON 200 AJ
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Online

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: Y
Responses: 7/47 (15% low)

Taught by: Lukas Hager
Instructor Evaluated: Lukas Hager-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes it was intellectually simulating and stretched my thinking.

2. This class was unlike anything I've learned before. It was interesting in relation to real-world application but challenging.

3. Yes, I have never taken an economics class before and it was very interesting.

4. Yes; topics from the class were presented differently from what the book offered and it made me think about the concept from a broader perspective.

5. It stretched my thinking in how firms have to abide to markets.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The textbook provided information relevant for the class.

2. The quiz sections and live practice helped me the most.

3. The examples that Lukas (TA) provided and explained during quiz section were extremely helpful.

4. Doing practice problems and discussing the answers as a class

5. The homework is where I learned the most but also quiz section with practice problems.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Nothing detracted from my learning.

2. I did not find the writing assignments very helpful in facilitating learning.

3. Sometimes it was hard to participate because it felt like nobody was participating.

4. Wasting a lot of time at the beginning of the live lectures of Professor Knox

5. Maybe the reading assignments

What suggestions do you have for improving this class generally?

1. Have live lectures where information is taught rather than having live lectured for solving problems and forcing us to learn information on our own times.

2. I would suggest more practice problems.

3. Maybe require that students keep their video on unless they absolutely cannot do so.

4. Getting straight to the material, or at least limit the Q&A section during the live lecture

5. None

If this course were offered remotely again, what suggestions do you have to improve the student experience?

1. Live lectures where information is taught.

3. Working in groups helped me the most and was a way to make sure people were actually listening and participating.

4. Read the book and don't get behind on that

5. None

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. *IASystem* reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.[1] In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4).*

Comparative ratings. *IASystem* provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, *IASystem* reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several *IASystem* items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. *IASystem* calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

---

[1] For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.