

Teaching Evaluations - Graduate Teaching Assistant, University of Washington

ECON 200: Introduction to Microeconomics | Four quiz sections | 2023-2024

Evaluation overview

Term / section	Overall	Contribution	Effectiveness
Spring 2024 (AD)	4.6	4.8	4.6
Winter 2024 (AJ)	4.7	4.8	4.8
Autumn 2023 (AD)	4.2	4.6	4.2
Spring 2023 (AB)	4.3	4.4	4.3

Notes: Overall = UW combined global summative median, Contribution = Quiz Section Instructor contribution, Effectiveness = Quiz Section Instructor teaching effectiveness. These measures use a 0-5 scale. The table reports unadjusted medians; the appended official reports provide adjusted ratings and item-level results.

Recurring strengths in student feedback

- Applied problem solving: students repeatedly identified quiz sections and worked examples as central to understanding course material.
- Accessibility: students highlighted office hours, prompt email responses, and thorough answers to questions.
- Clarity and reinforcement: students valued simpler explanations that connected lecture content to homework and exam-style problems.
- Enthusiasm and patience: comments emphasized a supportive environment, engagement, and patience when teaching difficult concepts.

Selected student comments

Spring 2024

"The TA was wonderful! He was so nice and enthusiastic and very knowledgeable, he got the whole class to engage and made sure everyone felt comfortable with the content, I wish he was my TA for every class!!"

"Jason being a good instructor and being patient when teaching."

Winter 2024

"I thought the quiz sections were useful, and actually going over problems was helpful."

"I think the quiz section contributed the most to my learning, along with the textbook quizzes."

Autumn 2023

"The aspects of this class that contributed most to my learning was the office hours and my TA's helping me through many of the homework problems that I was confused on. I always left the office hours feeling like I had my questions answered and I knew the content. Even if I realized I had more questions after office hours, the TA was quick to respond to my emails and answer my questions thoroughly."

Spring 2023

"Jason was very helpful with explaining the contents that we covered in class. His examples were easy and fun to understand, which I appreciated!"

"Keep doing what you're doing! This quiz section saved my grade in this class!"

Official Evaluation Report — Spring 2024 — ECON 200 AD



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2024

ECON 200 AD
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 12/41 (29% 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	4.8
(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: 4.1 (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:	12	50%	25%	25%				4.5	4.6
The content of the quiz section was:	12	58%	17%	25%				4.6	4.8
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	12	67%	17%	17%				4.8	4.9
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	12	58%	17%	25%				4.6	4.8

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:	12	17%	17%	25%	42%				4.8	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	12	8%	17%	25%	25%	8%	8%	8%	4.5	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	12	17%	33%	8%	17%	8%	17%		5.5	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	12	17%	17%	25%	17%	8%	17%		4.8	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	12	17%	8%	33%	25%	8%	8%		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: 5.5 (N=12)

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
25%	8%	17%	25%	8%	17%						

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

Class median: 2.8 (N=12)

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
33%	25%	8%	17%	8%			8%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=12)

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
8%	42%	17%		8%	17%		8%							

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

(N=12)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
42%	33%		8%	8%	8%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	12	58%	8%	25%	8%			4.6	5
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	12	50%	17%	33%				4.5	8
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	12	42%	17%	33%	8%			4.0	18
QSI's enthusiasm was:	12	58%	25%	17%				4.6	9
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	12	42%	42%	17%				4.3	16
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	12	42%	25%	33%				4.2	17
Answers to student questions were:	12	50%	25%	17%	8%			4.5	10
Interest level of quiz sections was:	12	33%	33%	17%	17%			4.0	15
QSI's openness to student views was:	12	50%	25%	25%				4.5	14
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	12	50%	33%	8%	8%			4.5	11
Availability of extra help when needed was:	12	50%	25%	17%	8%			4.5	12
Use of quiz section time was:	12	50%	33%	8%	8%			4.5	7
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	12	50%	25%	25%				4.5	13
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	12	58%	8%	33%				4.6	3
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	12	67%	8%	25%				4.8	1
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	12	58%	25%	17%				4.6	4
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	12	67%	25%	8%				4.8	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	12	58%	33%	8%				4.6	6

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 12/41 (29% low)

Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, I've never learnt about economics, so it's a completely new topic for myself.
2. Yes, the TA block was definitely the most helpful of all my time spent in Econ 200
3. The section was the most helpful in my learning and contributed the most to my understanding of the concepts presented in the lecture.
4. Yes because it was more personal
5. Yes I learned lots of things
6. Yes because we were able to work through provided examples that helped us understand how to approach problems that would potentially be on the exam.
7. Not really. The content is rather boring.
8. N/A
9. It was really obvious stuff mostly, like stuff you would figure out if you existed in a mostly free market for around 19 years.
10. Yes

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The exam-like examples we did in class.
2. The TA was wonderful! He was so nice and enthusiastic and very knowledgeable, he got the whole class to engage and made sure everyone felt comfortable with the content, I wish he was my TA for every class!!
3. Having the TA teach me the concepts with examples from the homework helped the most.
4. The examples and the in depth answers
5. Learning about the graphs and how to interpret
6. Working through examples
7. Helpful slides and good enthusiasm made it easier to learn.
8. N/A
10. Jason being a good instructor and being patient when teaching.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. It was relatively easy to not pay attention and think about something else.
2. None, his section was wonderful
3. None
4. The language barrier. Of anything
5. nothings
6. N/A
7. The content itself is simple and boring, with the only real challenge coming from the specific terminology differing from standard math.
8. N/A
10. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Make it more engaging with the students.
2. Making Jason Jung the teacher!
3. None
4. Nothing
5. nothing
6. N/A
7. More applicable situations that don't rely on several major assumptions.

- 8. N/A
- 10. 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.

Official Evaluation Report — Winter 2024 — ECON 200 AJ



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Winter 2024

ECON 200 AJ
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 4/12 (33% moderate)

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
4.7	4.6
(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: 4.1 (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:	4	50%	50%					4.5	4.4
The content of the quiz section was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	4.4
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	4	75%		25%				4.8	4.7
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	4	75%		25%				4.8	4.7

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:	4	25%		75%					5.2	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	4	25%		25%	50%				4.5	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	4		50%		50%				5.0	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	4		25%		75%				4.2	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	4	25%		75%					5.2	

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: 4.5 (N=4)

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
	25%	50%	25%								

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

Class median: 2.5 (N=4)

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
25%	50%	25%									

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=4)

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
25%	25%	50%												

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

(N=4)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
25%	25%		25%	25%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	4	50%	25%		25%			4.5	11
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	4	75%		25%				4.8	3
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	4	50%	50%					4.5	13
QSI's enthusiasm was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	10
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	4	75%		25%				4.8	9
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	8
Answers to student questions were:	4	50%	25%	25%				4.5	17
Interest level of quiz sections was:	4	50%		50%				4.0	18
QSI's openness to student views was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	7
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	4	75%			25%			4.8	4
Availability of extra help when needed was:	4	75%		25%				4.8	5
Use of quiz section time was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	2
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	6
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	4	75%	25%					4.8	1
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	4	50%	25%	25%				4.5	15
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	4	50%	25%	25%				4.5	12
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	4	50%	25%	25%				4.5	14
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	4	50%	25%	25%				4.5	16

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 4/12 (33% moderate)

Taught by: Jason Jung

Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes it was good, I thought about the economy in different ways than before.
2. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating. It introduced me to a new world of information and made me realize there is so much more to learn in the world of business and economics.
3. As this class isn't in my field of interest, I did not find it that interesting.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The quiz sections were the only good parts of this entire class, the actual lectures were wastes of time and it was never beneficial to go to class.
2. I think the quiz section contributed the most to my learning, along with the textbook quizzes.
3. I thought the quiz sections were useful, and actually going over problems was helpful.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The professor.
2. Nothing really detracted me from my learning.
3. Lectures seemed full of unnecessary information, and did not contribute much to learning.

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Change the professor and make the TA the professor instead.
2. I have no other suggestions.
3. Maybe more engagement in lectures, and maybe a later class time.

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.

Official Evaluation Report — Autumn 2023 — ECON 200 AD



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2023

ECON 200 AD
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 17/49 (35% moderate)

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
4.2	4.4
(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: 4.5 (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:	17	29%	47%	24%				4.1	4.3
The content of the quiz section was:	17	29%	47%	24%				4.1	4.3
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	17	53%	29%	18%				4.6	4.7
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	17	35%	47%	18%				4.2	4.4

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:	17		24%	35%	35%	6%			4.8	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	17	6%	41%	18%	12%	12%	6%	6%	5.3	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	17	12%	47%	12%	6%	6%	18%		5.7	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	17	18%	41%	6%	6%	18%	12%		5.7	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	17	6%	41%	18%	29%	6%			5.3	

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: 7.0 (N=17)

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
6%	6%	12%	35%	12%	6%	18%			6%		

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

Class median: 6.1 (N=17)

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
6%	29%	6%	29%	18%	6%	6%					

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.3 (N=17)

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
18%	18%	35%	18%	6%		6%								

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

(N=17)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
29%	29%	6%	6%	29%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	17	35%	35%	29%				4.1	12
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	17	35%	41%	24%				4.1	14
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	17	29%	41%	29%				4.0	16
QSI's enthusiasm was:	17	53%	24%	24%				4.6	8
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	17	41%	29%	29%				4.2	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	17	47%	24%	29%				4.4	11
Answers to student questions were:	17	29%	41%	29%				4.0	17
Interest level of quiz sections was:	17	29%	29%	29%	12%			3.8	15
QSI's openness to student views was:	17	59%	18%	24%				4.7	3
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	17	35%	47%	18%				4.2	13
Availability of extra help when needed was:	17	47%	35%	18%				4.4	9
Use of quiz section time was:	17	47%	29%	24%				4.4	4
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	17	53%	29%	12%	6%			4.6	6
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	17	35%	47%	12%	6%			4.2	10
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	17	47%	35%	6%	12%			4.4	7
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	17	47%	41%	6%	6%			4.4	5
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	17	59%	29%	12%				4.7	2
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	16	62%	25%	12%				4.7	1

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 17/49 (35% moderate)

Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. was very stimulating as i've never taken a business class before
2. Yes, it gave me an opportunity to actually do practice problems
3. This class was intellectually stimulating. Before this class I had a very vague understanding of economics but now after taking this class I believe that I have a strong grasp of the basics. I enjoyed that when I really put the time in to learn the content and think about what the topics really meant and how they were connected to each other I could truly understand.
4. It was stretching my thinking. Appropriate examples made easy to understand the topics well. Good explanation
5. Yes because there are some memorizations like knowing the equations of it.
6. This class was just recognizing patterns. Not the most stimulating but there were some interesting topics
7. This class did not stretch my thinking too much. Everything was fairly straight forward
8. Yea absolutely. I feel that the math and thinking process used in this class is like no other approach I have used before
9. Yes it was difficult
10. This class was intellectually stimulating and it stretched my thinking as well because of the amount of knowledge I consumed at the quiz sections and reading the textbook.
11. Yes. It helped to see the examples in quiz section
12. Yes, it introduced new concepts I was unfamiliar to and integrated them into the curriculum at a good pace.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. quiz section
2. Practice problems, and easy ways to remember complicated rules or theory's
3. The aspects of this class that contributed most to my learning was the office hours and my TA's helping me through many of the homework problems that I was confused on. I always left the office hours feeling like I had my questions answered and I knew the content. Even if I realized I had more questions after office hours, the TA was quick to respond to my emails and answer my questions thoroughly.
4. Nice explanation and answer to the question. Can understand hard concepts.
5. doing the hw assignments and writing, going to quiz sections, and also doing the practice problems
6. The TA quiz sections helped me the most
7. The quiz section
8. Lecture, quiz section, practicing with the homework
9. The readings and homeworks
10. study hours with my quiz section leader.
11. The examples from homework
12. Examples and applications to the real world

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. lecture
2. The fast pace
3. I believe that the lectures(Not the quiz sections) could have been condensed into more of the important ideas and connections of the content. I thought that the textbook was very helpful but the lecture was mainly a repeat of the textbook
5. Nothing
6. Nothing felt detracting
7. Some of the essays did not help my learning
8. I don't think really any
9. Some of the lectures didn't help
10. nothing.
11. Kinda was just like another lecture. Not really a bad thing though

12. None, really

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. more concise lectures
3. I believe that the lectures(Not the quiz sections) could be more interesting and differ more from what I had read in the textbook.
5. My suggestion is slow the pace a little and also do some more examples when explaining a concept.
6. N/A
7. Remove the essays from class
8. None
9. Make the lecture more detail oriented
10. I think the lecture materials shouldn't be word for word what the readings are because it makes people less likely to attend the big lectures.
11. Cover concepts in more detail
12. None, really

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.

Official Evaluation Report — Spring 2023 — ECON 200 AB



COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Spring 2023

ECON 200 AB
Introduction To Microeconomics
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 11/48 (23% 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
4.3	4.5
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 4.6 (1=lowest; 7=highest)
--

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	11	36%	36%	27%				4.1	4.4
The content of the quiz section was:	11	36%	45%	18%				4.2	4.4
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	11	45%	45%	9%				4.4	4.6
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	11	45%	27%	18%	9%			4.3	4.6

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:	11	9%	18%	18%	36%	18%			4.4	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	11	27%	27%	18%	18%		9%		5.7	
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	11	9%	18%	36%	27%	9%			4.9	
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	11	9%	27%	36%	27%				5.1	
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	11	9%	36%	18%	36%				5.2	

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: 6.0 (N=11)

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
	27%	18%	18%	18%	9%	9%					

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

Class median: 4.1 (N=11)

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
	36%	45%			18%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.2 (N=11)

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
18%	18%	18%	18%		18%	9%								

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

(N=11)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
36%	18%	9%		18%	18%

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	11	36%	36%	18%	9%			4.1	15
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	11	45%	36%	9%	9%			4.4	10
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	11	36%	45%	9%	9%			4.2	16
QSI's enthusiasm was:	11	55%	36%	9%				4.6	9
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	11	36%	27%	27%	9%			4.0	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	11	55%	27%	18%				4.6	8
Answers to student questions were:	11	55%	27%	18%				4.6	4
Interest level of quiz sections was:	11	45%	27%	18%	9%			4.3	5
QSI's openness to student views was:	11	45%	27%	27%				4.3	17
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	11	45%	36%	18%				4.4	11
Availability of extra help when needed was:	11	45%	36%	18%				4.4	14
Use of quiz section time was:	11	55%	27%	18%				4.6	1
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	11	55%	36%	9%				4.6	7
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	11	45%	36%	9%	9%			4.4	6
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	11	45%	27%	18%	9%			4.3	13
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	11	55%	36%	9%				4.6	2
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	11	55%	27%	9%	9%			4.6	3
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	11	45%	27%	18%	9%			4.3	12

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 11/48 (23% low)

Taught by: Jason Jung
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**Was this class intellectually stimulating? Did it stretch your thinking? Why or why not?**

1. Yes It did, it was hard to understand sometimes and it make you think about things in ways you have never even considered
2. It really helped me understand the lecture content better and actually be able to put it into practice.
3. this class was like coming back to math after 3 years of not doing math. It stretched my thinking and I was able to pick up on the process of solving problems easily, but the concepts took longer to understand.
5. The class was really good in explaining the gaps that I had from the lecture and also was really good at reinforcing the things we learned with the exercises that we did in class.
6. Yes, it was something I had never explored before
7. Jason was very helpful with explaining the contents that we covered in class. His examples were easy and fun to understand, which I appreciated!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Quiz section was the place where I learned the most!
3. the quiz section
4. I appreciated the annotated notes being sent after class. Sometimes, material went by fast and having those notes to refer to was helpful.
5. I think the aspect that contributed most to my learning was the quiz section as Jason would explain the terms in a more simple way than what was said in the lecture or from the readings.
6. Quiz section was very helpful and the homework assignments
7. Jason's passion and easy examples to memorized the terms.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. None
3. the homework was similar to what is taught in class, but the way questions are asked and structured does not mirror the exams. this made it hard.
5. The homework and how we had to pay so much money for it.
6. It was hard to sit and pay attentions in the king lectures
7. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Keep doing what you're doing! This quiz section saved my grade in this class!
3. the homework is good, but i wish it was more similar to the exam. the practice exams provided are great.
5. Overall I really enjoyed coming to section, while the class was pretty challenging, I found the section to be really helpful in covering the questions that I had
6. Spread the lectures out more
7. N/A

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.