

# Teaching Evaluations - Independent Instructor, University of Washington

ECON 200: Introduction to Microeconomics | Four independently taught sections | 2024-2026

## Evaluation overview

| Term / section  | Overall | Contribution | Effectiveness |
|-----------------|---------|--------------|---------------|
| Winter 2026 (B) | 4.1     | 4.5          | 4.0           |
| Spring 2025 (B) | 4.8     | 4.8          | 4.8           |
| Winter 2025 (B) | 4.1     | 4.4          | 4.3           |
| Autumn 2024 (C) | 4.5     | 4.7          | 4.2           |

**Notes:** Overall = UW combined global summative median, Contribution = Instructor contribution, Effectiveness = 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

- Practice-oriented instruction: students repeatedly highlighted worked examples, practice problems, and opportunities to solve problems during class.
- Accessibility and support: students noted that questions were welcome in class, after class, by email, and during office hours.
- Visual and structured explanations: graphs, annotated slides, and step-by-step visualizations were repeatedly identified as helpful.
- Approachability: students described difficult or math-intensive material as more manageable and emphasized encouragement and support.

## Selected student comments

### Winter 2026

*"I think the class is structured perfectly, where students learn a lot but are not overwhelmed. The instructor is always available for questions and help, and there are resources online, such as the book, as well as problem sets and the writing assignment, which further help understand the topics well. The only suggestion I would offer is to give more accurate examples of the exams so that students know what to expect in terms of format, that's it, though."*

### Spring 2025

*"The worked through visuals of our need to know concepts helped drastically. The math part of econ in this class is very simply but understanding how concepts like ATC or AVC cost curves work on a graph are harder to understand. So having us as a class work through a visualization of concepts helped with my learning immensely."*

### Winter 2025

*"exercises/problems in class & watching Jason work through them - easy to ask questions (in class, after class, through email, etc.) - problem sets & practice exams were pretty similar to what's on the actual exams - no "busy work" - Having the graphs/visual explanations & not just verbally explaining - Good use of time & ending class early"*

### Autumn 2024

*"The instructor Jason Jung made such a math intensive class very approachable. Jason constantly made us feel like we could do it and highlighted what aspects will be super important later on."*

*"The professor's posted presentations were very well organized and easily accessible which contributed the most to my understanding of the course."*

# Official Evaluation Report — Winter 2026 — ECON 200 B



## COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Economics  
Term: Winter 2026

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 6/38 (16% low)

Taught by: Jason - Jong Min - Jung

Instructor Evaluated: Jason - Jong Min - Jung-Predoc Inst

**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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1                   | 4.1                      |
| (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 course as a whole was:                                         | 6 | 33%           | 50%           |          | 17%      |          |               | 4.2    | 4.2             |
| The course content was:                                            | 6 | 33%           | 33%           | 17%      | 17%      |          |               | 4.0    | 4.0             |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was:                   | 6 | 50%           | 33%           |          | 17%      |          |               | 4.5    | 4.5             |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 6 | 17%           | 67%           |          | 17%      |          |               | 4.0    | 4.0             |

### 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:                               | 6 | 17%             | 33% | 17% | 33%         |     |     |                | 5.5    |  |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 6 |                 | 17% | 50% | 17%         |     |     | 17%            | 4.8    |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 6 |                 | 17% | 50% | 17%         |     |     | 17%            | 4.8    |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 6 |                 | 17% | 50% | 17%         |     |     | 17%            | 4.8    |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 6 | 17%             | 33% | 17% | 17%         |     |     | 17%            | 5.5    |  |

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 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=6)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 17% | 17% | 50% |     | 17%   |       |       |       |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=6)**

| 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% |     | 67% |     |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.6 (N=6)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 33%         | 33%          | 17%          | 17%         |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=6)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 17%           | 17%                             | 17%         |               | 50%                   |       |

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

|                                                                           | N | Excellent<br>(5) | Very<br>Good<br>(4) | Good<br>(3) | Fair<br>(2) | Poor<br>(1) | Very<br>Poor<br>(0) | Median | Relative<br>Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Course organization was:                                                  | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 6                |
| Sequential presentation of concepts was:                                  | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 7                |
| Explanations by instructor were:                                          | 6 |                  | 83%                 |             | 17%         |             |                     | 3.9    | 16               |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 6 |                  | 83%                 |             | 17%         |             |                     | 3.9    | 17               |
| Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:                       | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 12               |
| Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:         | 6 | 50%              | 33%                 | 17%         |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 2                |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:                         | 6 | 50%              | 50%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 9                |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was:                                              | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 15               |
| Clarity of course objectives was:                                         | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 8                |
| Interest level of class sessions was:                                     | 6 | 33%              | 33%                 | 17%         | 17%         |             |                     | 4.0    | 11               |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                               | 6 | 67%              | 33%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 1                |
| Use of class time was:                                                    | 6 | 50%              | 33%                 | 17%         |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 3                |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:                    | 6 | 33%              | 67%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 14               |
| Amount you learned in the course was:                                     | 6 | 33%              | 50%                 |             | 17%         |             |                     | 4.2    | 10               |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were:                          | 6 | 33%              | 33%                 | 33%         |             |             |                     | 4.0    | 18               |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:   | 6 | 33%              | 50%                 | 17%         |             |             |                     | 4.2    | 13               |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was:                                      | 6 | 50%              | 50%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 4                |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:                 | 6 | 50%              | 50%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 5                |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 6/38 (16% low)

Taught by: Jason - Jong Min - Jung  
Instructor Evaluated: Jason - Jong Min - Jung-Predoc Inst

#### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. yes i liked that we had exercises done during class so that we could make sure we understood what was taught.
2. Yes, was confusing but he helped it not be so much
3. This class was informative but not entirely stimulating. Examples and assigned questions did not introduce real world applications, and overall I found the content dull.
4. not particularly. Concepts and math was very low level and simple.
5. Because of my previous knowledge in microeconomics, the class was not too intellectually stimulating, but I did learn a lot of valuable and new information.

##### What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. the in person lectures.
2. slides being posted and being able to ask questions in class
3. Time provided in class to attempt questions and then solve as a class.
4. Practice problems.
5. The problem sets were a very helpful way to summarize all the learned information as well as get some practice. I would say they contributed the most to my learning.

##### What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. ending class early
3. Boardwork was often times messy and hard to follow.
4. N/A, I don't think much of anything took away from learning.
5. The only aspect of the class that detracted me from learning was that it was so early in the morning, causing us to space out our time often. However, I do recognise that it has nothing to do with the course itself.

##### What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

3. I think the quality was fine for an intro level Econ, but I would suggest bringing in current economic conditions to review in assignments.
4. The class is fine as is.
5. I think the class is structured perfectly, where students learn a lot but are not overwhelmed. The instructor is always available for questions and help, and there are resources online, such as the book, as well as problem sets and the writing assignment, which further help understand the topics well. The only suggestion I would offer is to give more accurate examples of the exams so that students know what to expect in terms of format, that's it, though.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 2025 — ECON 200 B



## COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Economics  
Term: Spring 2025

ECON 200 B  
Introduction To Microeconomics  
Course type: Face-to-Face  
Taught by: Jason Jung  
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 8/39 (21% 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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.8                   | 5.1                      |
| (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:

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| <b>CEI: 4.0</b>       |
| (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 course as a whole was:                                         | 8 | 62%           | 38%           |          |          |          |               | 4.7    | 5.0             |
| The course content was:                                            | 8 | 75%           | 25%           |          |          |          |               | 4.8    | 5.1             |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was:                   | 8 | 75%           | 25%           |          |          |          |               | 4.8    | 5.1             |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 8 | 75%           | 25%           |          |          |          |               | 4.8    | 5.1             |

### 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:                               | 8 |                 | 25% |     | 62%         |     | 12% |                | 4.1    |  |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 8 |                 | 25% | 25% | 38%         |     |     | 12%            | 4.5    |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 8 | 12%             | 12% | 25% | 38%         |     |     | 12%            | 4.5    |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 8 | 12%             | 12% | 12% | 38%         | 12% |     | 12%            | 4.2    |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 8 | 38%             |     | 12% | 38%         |     | 12% |                | 4.5    |  |

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: 10.5 Hours per credit: 2.1 (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% | 14% |     | 14%   | 29%   | 14%   |       |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 6.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 14% | 29% | 29% | 14% | 14%   |       |       |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=6)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 33%         | 67%          |              |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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 |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 43%           | 14%                             | 14%         |               | 29%                   |       |

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

|                                                                           | N | Excellent<br>(5) | Very<br>Good<br>(4) | Good<br>(3) | Fair<br>(2) | Poor<br>(1) | Very<br>Poor<br>(0) | Median | Relative<br>Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Course organization was:                                                  | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 3                |
| Sequential presentation of concepts was:                                  | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 1                |
| Explanations by instructor were:                                          | 8 | 62%              | 38%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 14               |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 8 | 62%              | 12%                 | 25%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 15               |
| Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:                       | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 9                |
| Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:         | 8 | 62%              | 12%                 | 25%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 10               |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:                         | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 17               |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was:                                              | 8 | 62%              | 38%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 18               |
| Clarity of course objectives was:                                         | 8 | 62%              | 38%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 11               |
| Interest level of class sessions was:                                     | 8 | 62%              | 25%                 | 12%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 7                |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                               | 8 | 75%              | 12%                 | 12%         |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 12               |
| Use of class time was:                                                    | 8 | 88%              | 12%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.9    | 2                |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:                    | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 13               |
| Amount you learned in the course was:                                     | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 6                |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were:                          | 8 | 62%              | 38%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 16               |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:   | 8 | 75%              | 25%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 8                |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was:                                      | 8 | 88%              | 12%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.9    | 4                |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:                 | 8 | 88%              | 12%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.9    | 5                |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 8/39 (21% low)

Taught by: Jason Jung  
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst

#### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. My major never dives into economic concepts. So this class did provide me knowledge in a field I had zero understanding
2. Yes, it helped me understand many economic concepts, but it was very difficult to connect the concepts with each other.
3. Yes, the concepts required you to think about how things affect each other.

##### What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. The worked through visuals of our need to know concepts helped drastically. The math part of econ in this class is very simply but understanding how concepts like ATC or AVC cost curves work on a graph are harder to understand. So having us as a class work through a visualization of concepts helped with my learning immensely.
2. The lectures, by far.
3. I think the homework and the examples. I liked the summaries in the homework especially.

##### What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. 1. Class time. This may not have been your fault but my god 6:30pm lectures are exhausting. I know you don't really have control over this but the university should not have a class run this late. 2. Lecture slides can be hard to understand if a lecture is missed. This class would benefit massively from panopto recordings. Especially as attendance is optional and such a late class. I know that would entice students to show up even less, but often your slides will show the final answer to a concept we need to know, but will often not have the steps leading up to that point. If panopto isn't an option, than maybe have a slide with a visual steps breakdown.
2. Not being able to connect certain things together that were relevant.
3. I think it was all good.

##### What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I understand your course load is very consistent but try to be understanding we are college students who may ask for extensions. Your email back was overly harsh and I think it may be smarter for you to assume a student asking for an extension is doing it out of need instead of laziness. I appreciate the apology later on when I clarified my problem but understand students may have a something going on or a health issue they don't want to discuss like I did and may just ask for an extension for a vague reason to not really say why they need it if its an uncomfortable subject. If a student does ask you for more than one extension in this class I think its fair to say no if they don't explain their need for it. But maybe just be a little nicer and have a freebie one for students not comfortable disclosing the reason they need an extension.
2. Explain how subjects are connected better.
3. One suggestion I have is labeling each weeks module and pdf with the topic.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 2025 — ECON 200 B



## COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Economics  
Term: Winter 2025

ECON 200 B  
Introduction To Microeconomics  
Course type: Face-to-Face  
Taught by: Jason Jung  
**Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst**

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 11/41 (27% 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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.1                   | 4.1                      |
| (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:

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| <b>CEI: 4.4</b><br>(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 course as a whole was:                                         | 11 | 27%           | 36%           | 36%      |          |          |               | 3.9    | 3.9             |
| The course content was:                                            | 11 | 18%           | 45%           | 36%      |          |          |               | 3.8    | 3.9             |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was:                   | 11 | 45%           | 45%           | 9%       |          |          |               | 4.4    | 4.4             |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 11 | 45%           | 27%           | 18%      | 9%       |          |               | 4.3    | 4.3             |

### 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:                               | 10 |                 | 50% | 10% | 20%         | 20% |     |                | 5.5    |  |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 10 |                 | 30% | 40% | 20%         | 10% |     |                | 5.0    |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 10 | 10%             | 20% | 30% | 20%         | 10% | 10% |                | 4.8    |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 10 | 10%             | 30% | 30% | 10%         | 10% | 10% |                | 5.2    |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 10 | 20%             | 20% |     | 50%         | 10% |     |                | 4.3    |  |

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: 4.3 Hours per credit: 0.9 (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% | 55% | 9%  |     | 9%    |       |       |       |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 3.3 Hours per credit: 0.7 (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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 55% | 18% | 9%  | 18% |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.9 (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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 64%         | 9%           | 9%           | 18%         |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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 |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 18%           | 45%                             |             | 9%            | 27%                   |       |

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

|                                                                           | N  | Excellent<br>(5) | Very<br>Good<br>(4) | Good<br>(3) | Fair<br>(2) | Poor<br>(1) | Very<br>Poor<br>(0) | Median | Relative<br>Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Course organization was:                                                  | 11 | 36%              | 36%                 | 27%         |             |             |                     | 4.1    | 9                |
| Sequential presentation of concepts was:                                  | 11 | 55%              | 27%                 | 9%          | 9%          |             |                     | 4.6    | 1                |
| Explanations by instructor were:                                          | 11 | 27%              | 45%                 | 18%         | 9%          |             |                     | 4.0    | 17               |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 11 | 45%              | 18%                 | 27%         | 9%          |             |                     | 4.2    | 11               |
| Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:                       | 11 | 64%              | 27%                 | 9%          |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 2                |
| Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:         | 11 | 45%              | 27%                 | 18%         |             | 9%          |                     | 4.3    | 6                |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:                         | 11 | 45%              | 36%                 | 18%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 16               |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was:                                              | 11 | 45%              | 45%                 | 9%          |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 12               |
| Clarity of course objectives was:                                         | 11 | 27%              | 55%                 | 9%          | 9%          |             |                     | 4.1    | 13               |
| Interest level of class sessions was:                                     | 11 | 27%              | 36%                 | 27%         |             |             | 9%                  | 3.9    | 15               |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                               | 11 | 45%              | 36%                 | 9%          | 9%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 10               |
| Use of class time was:                                                    | 11 | 55%              | 36%                 | 9%          |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 4                |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:                    | 11 | 55%              | 27%                 | 9%          | 9%          |             |                     | 4.6    | 7                |
| Amount you learned in the course was:                                     | 11 | 27%              | 36%                 | 36%         |             |             |                     | 3.9    | 18               |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were:                          | 11 | 36%              | 45%                 | 9%          | 9%          |             |                     | 4.2    | 14               |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:   | 11 | 55%              | 18%                 | 18%         |             | 9%          |                     | 4.6    | 5                |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was:                                      | 11 | 64%              | 27%                 | 9%          |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 3                |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:                 | 11 | 45%              | 45%                 | 9%          |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 8                |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 11/41 (27% low)

Taught by: Jason Jung  
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst

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

1. Somewhat yes because there were certain topics that I did not learn previously.
2. N/A
3. Yes it did. The instructor brought up topics I hadn't even considered and it stretched my thinking a lot.
4. I'd never taken an econ class before this one, so it definitely forced me to think in new ways.
5. Yes for sure. Economic concepts are somewhat confusing and difficult to understand. You have to take time to engrain the information into your head.

**What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?**

1. Going to lecture and submission post
2. N/A
3. lecture
4. - exercises/problems in class & watching Jason work through them - easy to ask questions (in class, after class, through email, etc.) - problem sets & practice exams were pretty similar to what's on the actual exams - no "busy work" - Having the graphs/visual explanations & not just verbally explaining - Good use of time & ending class early
5. The examples in class and the practice sets.

**What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?**

1. My other classes and work.
2. N/A
3. none
4. The explanations. I understand that it's hard to explain some of the reasoning/concepts, though, since people learn in different ways and it's only a 200-level course.
5. The information that was presented that was just "extra" and not needed to know.

**What suggestions do you have for improving the class?**

1. The instructor's handwriting and recording lectures.
2. N/A
3. none
4. Sometimes he tried to remove the math to make it less complicated, but some people like having it.
5. Slow down the lectures a bit as I felt like I was being rushed some of the time. Also have more review materials such as practice problems. Also make the practice tests we were given actually similar to what is going to be on the exams.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 2024 — ECON 200 C



## COURSE SUMMARY REPORT Numeric Responses

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

ECON 200 C  
Introduction To Microeconomics  
Course type: Face-to-Face  
Taught by: Jason Jung  
Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 16/35 (46% 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 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.5                   | 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:

|                                          |
|------------------------------------------|
| <b>CEI: 5.1</b><br>(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 course as a whole was:                                         | 16 | 56%           | 19%           | 12%      | 6%       | 6%       |               | 4.6    | 4.5             |
| The course content was:                                            | 16 | 44%           | 25%           | 19%      | 12%      |          |               | 4.2    | 4.2             |
| The instructor's contribution to the course was:                   | 16 | 62%           | 19%           | 12%      |          | 6%       |               | 4.7    | 4.6             |
| The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was: | 16 | 44%           | 19%           | 19%      | 12%      |          | 6%            | 4.2    | 4.1             |

### 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:                               | 15 | 27%             | 27% |     | 27%         | 13% | 7%  |                | 5.6    |  |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 15 | 20%             | 33% | 40% | 7%          |     |     |                | 5.6    |  |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 15 | 7%              | 40% | 33% | 20%         |     |     |                | 5.4    |  |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 15 | 7%              | 53% | 20% | 20%         |     |     |                | 5.7    |  |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 15 | 13%             | 47% | 13% | 20%         | 7%  |     |                | 5.7    |  |

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: 4.9 Hours per credit: 1 (N=15)**

| 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% | 33% | 13% | 13% | 7%    |       |       | 7%    |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 5.2 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=15)**

| 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% | 27% | 27% | 13% |       |       |       | 7%    |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=15)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 47%         | 20%          | 13%          | 13%         |              | 7%           |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=15)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 40%           | 40%                             | 7%          |               | 13%                   |       |

**STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS**

|                                                                           | N  | Excellent<br>(5) | Very<br>Good<br>(4) | Good<br>(3) | Fair<br>(2) | Poor<br>(1) | Very<br>Poor<br>(0) | Median | Relative<br>Rank |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Course organization was:                                                  | 15 | 67%              | 13%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 3                |
| Sequential presentation of concepts was:                                  | 15 | 53%              | 13%                 | 33%         |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 9                |
| Explanations by instructor were:                                          | 15 | 40%              | 20%                 | 33%         |             | 7%          |                     | 4.0    | 18               |
| Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was: | 15 | 47%              | 27%                 | 20%         | 7%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 14               |
| Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:                       | 15 | 47%              | 40%                 | 13%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 13               |
| Instructor's enhancement of student interest in the material was:         | 15 | 47%              | 33%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 11               |
| Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:                         | 15 | 47%              | 33%                 | 13%         | 7%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 17               |
| Instructor's enthusiasm was:                                              | 15 | 53%              | 40%                 | 7%          |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 15               |
| Clarity of course objectives was:                                         | 15 | 53%              | 33%                 | 13%         |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 10               |
| Interest level of class sessions was:                                     | 15 | 53%              | 13%                 | 33%         |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 8                |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                               | 15 | 73%              | 20%                 | 7%          |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 4                |
| Use of class time was:                                                    | 15 | 73%              | 20%                 | 7%          |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 2                |
| Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:                    | 15 | 73%              | 20%                 | 7%          |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 6                |
| Amount you learned in the course was:                                     | 15 | 47%              | 27%                 | 27%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 12               |
| Relevance and usefulness of course content were:                          | 15 | 47%              | 27%                 | 20%         | 7%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 16               |
| Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:   | 15 | 67%              | 13%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 5                |
| Reasonableness of assigned work was:                                      | 15 | 93%              | 7%                  |             |             |             |                     | 5.0    | 1                |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:                 | 15 | 67%              | 27%                 | 7%          |             |             |                     | 4.8    | 7                |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: B  
Responses: 16/35 (46% moderate)

Taught by: Jason Jung  
**Instructor Evaluated: Jason Jung-Predoc Inst**

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes. Because when i learn Miro economy in my high school, i have not learned some of the logic and concept.
2. Yes, but I have taken econ previously, so most content was not new to me
3. Yes it was! The practice problems challenged my thinking and allowed to me develop the skills that I need for future problems.
4. Yes. Although I had learned some microeconomics in the past, this class gave me clarity.
5. Yes, it did stretch my thinking. During lectures, I was forced to be actively engaged so I could follow along and truly understand the material.
6. This class was intellectually stimulating as I was unaware of any content presented in this course prior to taking it. I was challenged to study and understand concepts that were interesting to me.
7. yes it did, it gave me a very different view on what the economy was like and how I can apply my skills in other classes to real life examples
8. Yes because I never knew anything about economics so this broaden my horizons.
9. This class felt a lot of like there was a lot of calculating and math involved and rarely any exploration about how economics can be used to better society. Positive and negative externality were probably the only examples given on how economics can better society but still this only focused on how we calculate both in regards to a firm. If this curriculum was the only exposure to economics I would not find it interesting for my goal of bettering society.
10. Yes. In my opinion this class broaden my knowledge in Economics and it sort of helped me in connecting Economics theory with what is happening in the real world making me understand better on the global economic situation.

### What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. doing exercise individually, and then Jason show the answer, explaining why
2. Office hours and opportunities to ask questions
3. The professor's posted presentations were very well organized and easily accessible which contributed the most to my understanding of the course.
4. Good examples the instructor gave.
5. The lectures and the powerpoints for sure.
6. The math aspects of the class in combination with the ideas was most helpful. I learned a lot with the application of concepts into mathematical problems.
7. the powerpoint slides (annotated) were super helpful
8. It taught me more aspects of business like what firms have to consider and go through in the market.
9. The instructor Jason Jung made such a math intensive class very approachable. Jason constantly made us feel like we could do it and highlighted what aspects will be super important later on.
10. Lectures and the writing essay.

### What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. some noisy classmates
2. Slight disorganized structure of lectures
3. None.
4. It was usually never the class and my own sleepiness.
5. The fact that there were no recordings to look back on. That would have been helpful.
6. One aspect that detracted from my learning was the professor's explanations at times. He doesn't speak perfect English, so understanding him at times was difficult.
7. The pace in class was really fast
8. I felt that the class subject was a little tricky which made me discouraged but I don't think it's entirely the prof fault.
9. How math intensive this class is and how the class's focus is on bettering firm's profit and efficiency and not on how economics can be utilized to better society.
10. None because in my opinion all the aspects of this class contributed to my learning.

### What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. it would be better if we can do more exercise in class

2. More organized lectures
3. None.
4. I think it was great overall. I think some students would've enjoyed a more explicit grading rubric.
5. Start recording lectures.
6. I would suggest cleaning up the slideshows so that they can be viewed asynchronously more effectively. The information was there, but they were put together in ways that made it seem like you needed to be present in class for the material to really stick, which is difficult because I missed multiple classes for athletic commitments for the men's soccer team.
7. slowing down the teaching and having more examples that we work together, not just having gaps of time where we have to do the examples
8. Your own practice exams (maybe not from other profs) because it helps provide students the security to feel confident for the exams. In class there are some things taught that aren't on the slides but I think it's more organized to have it all on the slides and organized because annotated made it hard to read. Include step 1, step 2, step 3, etc. In one lecture you included that and it was really helpful on how to solve one problem. I think more of that helps! Overall, organization and your own practice exams.
9. My suggestion is that perhaps the curriculum can involve more ways that economics can help society instead of how it helps firms and corporations maximize profits. I think that focusing on math and profit maximization dissuades potential altruistic people from having the study of economics as a goal. Jason Jung shared with us his interest in using economics to help understand the opioid crisis and I wish more nuggets of how these two are correlated is shown.
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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.