

PUBPOL 517 CA
Economics For Policy Analysis And Management II
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Vedavati Patwardhan
Instructor Evaluated: Vedavati Patwardhan-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A1
Responses: 16/28 (57% high)

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	5.0
(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 course as a whole was:	16	50%	44%	6%				4.5	4.8
The course content was:	16	62%	25%	12%				4.7	5.0
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	16	62%	31%	6%				4.7	5.0
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	16	62%	31%	6%				4.7	5.0

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:	15	7%	7%	33%	40%	7%		7%	4.4
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	13%	40%	13%	33%				5.6
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	40%	20%	7%	33%				6.0
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	20%	27%	13%	40%				5.2
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	33%	20%	13%	33%				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: 5.5 (N=14)

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
21%	7%	21%	29%	7%	7%						7%

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

Class median: 4.7 (N=14)

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
21%	7%	36%	21%		7%						7%

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.5 (N=14)

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
14%	36%	36%	7%			7%								

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

(N=14)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
14%	64%			21%	

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Course organization was:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	4
Clarity of instructor's voice was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	14
Explanations by instructor were:	15	53%	40%	7%				4.6	9
Instructor's ability to present alternative explanations when needed was:	15	40%	40%	20%				4.2	18
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	53%	47%					4.6	11
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	15	47%	47%	7%				4.4	15
Student confidence in instructor's knowledge was:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	17
Instructor's enthusiasm was:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	10
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	12
Answers to student questions were:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	13
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	67%	13%	13%	7%			4.8	3
Use of class time was:	15	60%	40%					4.7	1
Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	15	73%	20%	7%				4.8	2
Amount you learned in the course was:	15	53%	40%	7%				4.6	7
Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	15	47%	33%	20%				4.4	16
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, projects, etc.) were:	15	53%	40%	7%				4.6	8
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	6
How comfortable were students expressing opinions in class?	15	53%	40%	7%				4.6	
To what degree were multiple perspectives represented in class discussions and reading assignments?	14	36%	43%	21%				4.2	
How effectively were diversity issues brought into the course (e.g. race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, political ideology, socio-economic class)?	14	36%	29%	21%	14%			4.0	

PUBPOL 517 CA
Economics For Policy Analysis And Management II
Course type: Face-to-Face
Taught by: Vedavati Patwardhan
Instructor Evaluated: Vedavati Patwardhan-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: A1
Responses: 16/28 (57% high)

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

1. This class allowed us to explore class concepts in greater depth and practice solving problems in preparation for assignments, quizzes, and exams.
2. Yes the class was intellectually stimulating because it enabled me to get a knowledge of the market failures.
3. Veda did a great job of giving us extra practice on the material we needed to know for the quizzes and midterms and her study sessions were above and beyond what was required of her.
7. Veda did an excellent job of taking the material from lecture and expanding on it in quiz section. She presented different ways to think through a problem and gave us supplemental materials that were really beneficial for studying.
9. Somewhat, Veda going through examples did sometimes stretch my thinking.
11. She did a great job applying concepts to real world examples and I learned a ton. I feel like I learned far more in this economics class than I have in any other one I've taken, she really got the concepts through in a way I haven't experienced from a professor/TA duo before and I really appreciated that.

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. I appreciated the Powerpoint slides and the ample practice time of quiz section.
2. The close connections between what we learned in the class and the policies in the real world.
3. Veda's patience and intelligence.
4. Veda was great - organized, efficient, supportive, and knowledgeable. She often asked for feedback from the students to make sure TA sections were helpful - which was appreciated, but not needed since they were always great! She provided really helpful lecture slides and very high-quality practice problems during TA section, and kept the class on track to ensure we completed everything. The topics she covered complemented the main course well - highlighting the key points while providing an opportunity to practice the most difficult concepts. I also appreciated her exam review sessions, and the use of surveys to see which topics students wanted her to cover during these sessions.
5. Walking through problems was helpful. Having the slides posted with solutions was also very helpful when studying later on.
6. Veda was always extra prepared for quiz sections. Here examples were really helpful for understanding homework! I also really appreciated that she asked students what topics they would like to cover for review sessions.
7. Veda's ability to walk through the steps of each problem and her willingness to supply extra materials and assistance.
8. Thanks for all the work you put into sharing examples and making time for exam review sessions!
9. Walking through examples.
10. Thank you Veda for the very helpful PowerPoints with practice problems! These were huge in helping my studying.
11. All the practice problems and time spent on theories was really appreciated

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. The time constraint sometimes forced Veda to rush through material at the end of class, but I know that the 50-minute time block is out of her control.
2. NO.
3. It was expected that we were all poor math students.
7. N/A
9. N/A
11. I didn't love having a quant class in a three hour block, that was intellectually difficult

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. I would recommend Veda hold office hours for two hours on one day, rather than for an hour on two days because I felt that it was difficult to ask my questions in just one hour, especially when others were competing for time.
2. Have more practice problems related to the real policies.
3. More challenging math.
5. I think encouraging students to work together more during section on the practice problems.
7. N/A
9. N/A
11. None I can think of!

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.