

B ECON 510 H
Microeconomics For Managers
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F16
Responses: 44/69 (64% high)

Taught by: Alexis Leon, Lukas Hager
Instructor Evaluated: Lukas Hager-Grad TA

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

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	4.8
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	44	50%	36%	11%	2%			4.5	4.8
The content of the quiz section was:	44	57%	32%	11%				4.6	4.9
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	44	59%	30%	11%				4.7	4.9
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	44	57%	32%	9%	2%			4.6	4.8

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

	N	Much Higher (7)	(6)	(5)	Average (4)	(3)	(2)	Much Lower (1)	Median
Relative to other college courses you have taken:									
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	44	11%	25%	30%	32%	2%			5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	43	37%	35%	23%	5%				6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	43	30%	42%	21%	5%	2%			6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	42	29%	50%	12%	10%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	42	31%	45%	14%	10%				6.1

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?

Class median: 5.4 Hours per credit: 1.4 (N=41)

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
	12%	39%	20%	10%	7%	5%	2%			5%	

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

Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=41)

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
	20%	41%	10%	7%	12%		5%	2%			2%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=42)

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
5%	21%	48%	24%		2%									

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:

(N=41)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
24%	32%			44%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Usefulness of Review Sessions were:	44	64%	25%	11%				4.7	
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	44	57%	32%	11%				4.6	3
TA's use of examples and illustrations was:	44	64%	25%	11%				4.7	
Student confidence in TA's knowledge was:	44	68%	23%	9%				4.8	
Answers to student questions were:	43	65%	26%	9%				4.7	2
Availability of extra help when needed was:	43	67%	23%	9%				4.8	1
TA's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	44	64%	23%	14%				4.7	
Quality/helpfulness of TA feedback was:	44	61%	32%	7%				4.7	
The Teaching Assistant as a whole was:	44	66%	25%	9%				4.7	

B ECON 510 H
Microeconomics For Managers
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F16
Responses: 44/69 (64% high)

Taught by: Alexis Leon, Lukas Hager
Instructor Evaluated: Lukas Hager-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What aspects of review sessions were helpful to your learning?

1. The review sessions seemed almost necessary to keep up with the content. I think Lukas did a good job answering questions and making sure students knew the correct answer before moving on.
2. Walking through examples which related back directly to the course helped understand how course content applied back.
3. Partnership with Alexis to make sure all questions were answered. Homework comments were extremely helpful both in things we got right and wrong.
4. Lukas was great at teaching the concepts. I came back to the review sessions many times to review.
5. Lukas did a great job of engaging the students during review sessions. He wasn't just talking at the room - he asked everyone a lot of questions and made sure people were following.
7. The examples and game theories.
9. The review sessions really helped bring everything together. Exploring the concepts further and allowing for questions really helps. Unfortunately, I cannot attend the sessions live due to my work schedule so the recordings are great and very valuable!
10. Thanks for being so engaging in both the Foster Lives and review sessions! Even though I did not attend too many (just because I was not caught up by the time Thursdays came around and would have nothing to contribute), the recordings were extremely helpful and you keep things clear and concise and that goes a long way.
11. Problem sets and explanations
12. Example problems were great practice to work through to assess understanding and highlight areas that I needed to focus on.
13. Going over the problems and explaining things in an easier way than the book.
14. Review of the week's content, and the recordings
15. Everything about the review sessions were extremely valuable and helpful. I studied really hard using the review session recordings, and I feel like I was able to fill in all of the knowledge gaps I still had from the textbook readings and or the Foster Live discussions. A+++ job on leading the reviews, Lukas!
16. I always appreciated the TA's responsiveness in the chat and the examples given. Refreshing topics and going over additional examples is what helped the most.
17. Lukas was very knowledgeable and kept everyone engaged. Easy to understand and always prepared. It really wasn't a review session but was like having an extra deep dive lecture where we could participate! We probably learned as much in the review sessions as the main Foster Live classes.
18. Having the course material covered using different examples and at a slightly different pace was helpful in putting together the concepts taught in the course.
19. Examples to elaborate how to solve problems and to answer questions.
20. Going through problems during review sessions and having the recording to refer back to were helpful.
21. N/A. did not attend any.
22. N/A
23. Team assignment and review sessions
24. Lukas would regularly engage the audience in working through examples, and would provide easy to understand explanations for each concept.
26. Review sessions were more helpful than class replays
27. Very thorough review sessions. Was never able to make it to a Thursday session but the reviews were readily available and clear.

What aspects of review sessions could be improved?

1. The pace could have been improved. At times we did not cover all of the material in a timely fashion, which was an issue since we had other review sessions following the Econ session. Within the review sessions there were usually about a dozen students there, which should indicate that those of us showing up were likely the ones who needed additional help. My recommendation would be to not spend as much time waiting for students to supply answers or estimations, and keep the session moving so all or most of the content can be discussed.
2. No suggestions
3. Only change I would make is the speed at which the reviews were paced. They were really valuable but the slides went so quickly it could be hard to keep up and take notes.
4. Not much. They were the best review sessions I've had so far.
7. na
8. N/A

9. I found it helpful in the reviews when there was time to review the Hmwrk questions but I understand there isn't always time. So the Hmwrk set solutions act as a good review in this sense and it allows me to follow step by step to see what I may have missed or expand further on one idea or another.
10. n/a
11. More time could be allotted
12. n/a
13. More questions that are similar to the exams.
14. None
15. Nothing, they were perfect!
16. Can't think of any at the moment.
17. They were great!
18. There seems there is never enough time to thoroughly cover the materials during the review sessions but the videos and instructors are always available so that helps. Time is the biggest issue during the review sessions.
19. No. All good.
20. Exploring different scenarios and possibilities beyond what the question stated to help with more difficult problems.
21. N/A
22. N/A
23. more variety
24. N/A - Lukas was great
25. Slow down and use more examples that can better represent what types of questions are tested on.

Any additional comments?

1. I thought overall Lukas was very knowledgeable and exceedingly helpful. Very responsive, I'd be happy to see him as our TA for Macro as well.
3. Lukas is fantastic!
4. Lukas deserves a raise!
6. Lukas is a fantastic TA. He is clearly passionate about the subject matter and does an excellent job fielding student questions and providing (often real world) explanations that are digestible and immediately applicable. His review sessions were instrumental in my understanding of the material. Thank you Lukas!
7. Thanks for all of your help this quarter.
8. These review sessions were exceedingly helpful, organized and expertly executed. Lukas is clearly very knowledgeable but succeeded in creating space for us to contribute and learn at our own pace. Phenomenal TA
9. The course is laid out well. I found the quizzes helpful as they were not graded. If I was struggling with a concept I could give it my best then if I failed there wasn't a negative consequence. Rather, I could review the correct steps and see where I made a misstep.
10. Thank you! Good luck with the rest of your PhD!
11. Lukas was awesome! Very knowledgeable, patient and helpful
12. n/a
13. No, TA did a great job and was confident in a tough subject.
15. Lukas is an incredible TA. One of the best I've ever had.
18. None at this time.
19. Lukas knows very well of what he is TAing and did a great job leading the reviewing sessions. He's patient, efficient and humorous which makes the sessions fun. I only joined the live sessions few times due to time conflict and really appreciate the recording. Thank you Lukas!
20. Thank you!
21. Thanks Lukas! All feedback during Foster Live was great and detailed answers to all homework assignments and quizzes were very helpful.
22. N/A
23. Excellent course and faculty
24. Lukas was very prompt in his responses, the material for the review sessions was highly relevant and helpful, and I really appreciated his feedback in each assignment; he went beyond just the standard "good job", or "You missed X", and provided valuable insight into how to approach each problem.

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.