IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2020

TMMBA 507 A
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Online

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F16
Responses: 10/34 (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
4.2	**4.3**

(0=lowest; 5=highest)

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

CEI: 5.3
(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:	10	50%		30%	10%	10%		4.0	4.1
The content of the quiz section was:	10	40%	10%	40%	10%			3.5	3.7
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	10	40%	30%	10%	20%			4.2	4.3
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	50%	20%	10%	10%		10%	4.5	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:	10	30%	10%	20%	20%	10%		10%	5.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	10	30%	50%	10%	10%				6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	10	20%	40%	40%					5.8
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	10	20%	20%	50%	10%				5.3
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	10	50%	10%	20%	20%				6.5

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: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.9 (N=10)**

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
10%		10%	30%	30%	20%						

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 4.5 Hours per credit: 1.1 (N=10)**

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
10%	30%	20%	20%	20%							

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.7 (N=10)**

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
20%	50%		10%									20%		

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: **(N=10)**

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
30%	20%			50%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2020

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Usefulness of Review Sessions were:	10	70%		20%	10%			4.8	
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	10	70%		20%	10%			4.8	1
TA's use of examples and illustrations was:	10	60%		20%	20%			4.7	
Student confidence in TA's knowledge was:	10	60%	10%	30%				4.7	
Answers to student questions were:	10	60%		20%	20%			4.7	3
Availability of extra help when needed was:	9	67%	11%	22%				4.8	2
TA's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	10	70%		20%	10%			4.8	
Quality/helpfulness of TA feedback was:	9	78%		11%	11%			4.9	
The Teaching Assistant as a whole was:	10	60%	10%	20%	10%			4.7	

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 A
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Online

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F16
Responses: 10/34 (29% low)

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

What aspects of review sessions were helpful to your learning?

2. 1. Slides were very informative, clean and precise. Slides were complete with information, when later I went back to the slides to recap things, it was helpful. 2. I always looked forward to the review sessions. Very engaging. 3. It was a great complement to the main live class. I think I learned a lot more stuff from the review sessions.

3. the pdf doc was very helpful. Much more helpful than coarse material powerpoint slides

4. Dmitry's PowerPoints were very organized. His explanations were great. He answered all my questions in class and over email quickly and thoroughly.

5. I attended first couple sessions. Macroeconomics is more about reading textbook and wall street journal, economic times etc.. I did not find TA sessions that productive to spend an hour every Thursday especially when 3 TA sessions were back to back.

6. Reviewing concepts

What aspects of review sessions could be improved?

4. The review sessions cover a lot of material. I think it would be beneficial to sacrifice some material to have 10 minutes at the end dedicated to open Q&A about quizzes, homework, and general questions.

Any additional comments?

1. Thank you for the great TA sessions!

4. Dmitry was a great TA!

6. Quiz section needed answer feedback to be effective

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.

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2019

TMMBA 507 A
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: H
Responses: 20/38 (53% high)

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-TA

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

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.6	**4.5**

(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: 5.4

(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 lab section as a whole was:	20	60%	20%	20%				4.7	4.6
The content of the lab section was:	20	60%	25%	15%				4.7	4.6
The lab instructor's contribution to the course was:	20	60%	25%	15%				4.7	4.6
The lab instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	20	50%	35%	15%				4.5	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:	20	20%	40%	15%	20%	5%			5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	20	25%	50%	15%	10%				6.0
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	20	15%	40%	30%	15%				5.6
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	20	20%	40%	20%	20%				5.8
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	20	15%	55%	10%	20%				5.9

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 Hours per credit: 1.4 (N=20)

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
15%	20%	15%	15%	15%	10%	5%	5%				

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

Class median: 5.0 Hours per credit: 1.2 (N=20)

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
15%	20%	20%	20%	15%	5%		5%				

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.6 (N=20)

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
20%	60%	10%	5%	5%										

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

(N=20)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
45%	25%			30%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2019

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the lab instructor were:	20	50%	45%	5%				4.5	9
Lab instructor's preparedness for lab sessions was:	20	65%	35%					4.7	8
Quality of questions or problems raised by the lab instructor was:	20	50%	45%	5%				4.5	11
Lab instructor's enthusiasm was:	20	50%	45%	5%				4.5	17
Student confidence in lab instructor's knowledge was:	20	55%	35%	10%				4.6	14
Lab instructor's ability to solve unexpected problems was:	20	45%	30%	25%				4.3	18
Answers to student questions were:	20	45%	30%	25%				4.3	16
Interest level of lab sessions was:	20	45%	40%	15%				4.4	5
Communication and enforcement of safety procedures were:	20	55%	40%	5%				4.6	13
Lab instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	19	42%	47%	11%				4.3	15
Availability of extra help when needed was:	20	55%	35%	10%				4.6	10
Use of lab section time was:	20	55%	30%	15%				4.6	2
Lab instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	20	60%	30%	10%				4.7	7
Amount you learned in the lab sections was:	20	45%	45%	10%				4.4	12
Relevance and usefulness of lab section content were:	20	60%	30%	10%				4.7	3
Coordination between lectures and lab activities was:	20	60%	35%	5%				4.7	1
Reasonableness of assigned work for lab section was:	20	55%	35%	10%				4.6	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	20	55%	35%	10%				4.6	6

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2019

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 A	Evaluation Delivery: Online
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds	Evaluation Form: H
Course type: Face-to-Face	Responses: 20/38 (53% high)

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yes, Dmitry often took topics from class and had attendees elaborate on them through additional examples

2. Yes, the review session select most relevant of content and is good complementary knowledge of the class.

3. Yes. The TA provided a great alternative perspective to the concepts covered in the class.

4. Yes

5. Yes, I enjoyed this class and believe that this part was understand the economy.

6. Yes, the review sessions were great! They really supported the lectures and helped alot with elaborating on the concepts presented.

7. Helps sessions were intellectually stimulating and revisit all the lectures concepts was very helpful.

8. Helpful to learn decision modeling, unfortunately the coursework was not enough repetition for me to remember all the steps down the road. Luckily I have the text book to refer to down the road if needed.

9. Yes. The review helps reinforce the information in Debra's class.

10. Dmitry did a great job of reviewing the content from class in a different way than it was initially taught, which enabled me to get much more out of the course than I would have otherwise.

11. Dmitry's TA sessions were incredibly helpful and stretched my thinking.

12. Yes. Yes. Thinking about the macro economy as a whole will stretch anyone's thinking!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Being able to ask clarifying questions on specifics from the previous lecture

2. It is well structured.

3. Reinforcing key class concepts

4. The slide deck

5. The conversations, the discussions and tying the current issues to the learning.

6. Dmitry was great at presenting explanations and answering our questions from the review sessions.

7. Revision of lecture concepts and clarification of doubts was helpful.

8. The exercises were helpful to practice. At the beginning of the course I had more time to work through the examples in the book, and got off to a good start. Towards the end I only had time to do the actual assignments.

9. Presentation slides and his teaching.

10. His slides were well organized and easy to understand

11. The slide decks were clear, concise, and relevant. I appreciated the extra time Dmitry spends with students to make sure they really understand a concept. He was very personable and I always felt comfortable asking for help or clarification.

12. Working the problem sets

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. none of it

2. No

3. N/A

4. None

5. None

6. Nothing

7. No detraction

8. the technical issues while attending class live were a bit frustrating. Emisa did well to recover and add the additional content for the video for review on our own time.

9. Some of the discussion could manage the time better.

10. None

11. N/A

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. much of the slides used to guide the conversation were simple text with term definitions, incorporating more illustrative examples would of been helpful

2. No

3. Terrific instructor. Great job!

4. None

5. None

7. No really.

8. Emisa could speak a little louder or make sure the microphone is amplifying her voice enough. At time it was hard to hear her.

9. Please halt any conversation that seems anecdotal to be addressed later.

10. None

11. 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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 B
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 16/34 (47% 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	**4.5**

(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: 5.5
(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:	16	56%	31%	6%	6%			4.6	4.5
The content of the quiz section was:	16	50%	31%	12%	6%			4.5	4.4
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	16	62%	31%	6%				4.7	4.6
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	16	69%	25%	6%				4.8	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:	15	27%	33%	7%	33%				5.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	27%	40%	13%	20%				5.9
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	27%	40%	20%	13%				5.9
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	20%	47%	7%	27%				5.9
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	15	27%	40%	13%	20%				5.9

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: 7.5 Hours per credit: 1.9 (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
	29%	14%	7%	21%	29%						

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

Class median: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.6 (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%	21%	14%	14%	29%						

What grade do you expect in this course?

Class median: 3.8 (N=13)

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
46%	38%	8%		8%										

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

(N=13)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
54%	15%			31%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

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:	15	53%	33%	13%				4.6	14
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	67%	20%	13%				4.8	8
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	9
QSI's enthusiasm was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	17
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	15	60%	20%	20%				4.7	18
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	16
Answers to student questions were:	15	60%	20%	20%				4.7	12
Interest level of quiz sections was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	3
QSI's openness to student views was:	15	67%	13%	20%				4.8	11
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	15	67%	20%	13%				4.8	7
Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	13
Use of quiz section time was:	15	80%	13%	7%				4.9	1
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	15	60%	27%	13%				4.7	15
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	5
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	6
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	2
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	15	67%	27%	7%				4.8	4
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	60%	33%	7%				4.7	10

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 B
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 16/34 (47% moderate)

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Other

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. The Macroeconomics class helped me understand more about the world around me and why certain news articles and measures are important. Appreciate the clarity with which the topic was presented given the complexity and detail that Macroeconomics could entail.

2. Yes, Yes, working through examples was critical to understanding the relationships between concepts.

3. I liked the quizzes. The quizzes focused on understanding concepts through multiple choice questions and a real world economic situation essay

4. Yes. Yes. Great coverage and new topics.

6. Yes.

7. Concepts were challenging, but presented in a relevant way that focused on an immediate application.

8. The TA session was well organized and the content was very useful for understanding the concepts taught in class further. Dmitry did a great job conducting the sessions

9. Yes. New concepts were intriguing

10. The extra sessions were helpful to gain depth in the subject. thank you!

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Slides being available. Group presentations. Focus on concepts and topics with a close eye on use of time. Quizzes and essays that reinforced concepts in class.

2. Worked examples and secondary explanations to questions.

3. TA sessions and quizsses

4. Prof lecture, TA session

5. The Help sessiosn very effectively enforced the concepts that Prof Debra taught in class. This helped solidify our understanding. The help sessions were very nicely structured and sessions itself were timed nicely to follow the classes.

6. Teach back quizzes etc

7. lectures and review sessions

8. TA sessions and the quiz

9. The use of real world examples

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

1. Lack of time to dive deep into the finer details of Macroeconomics.

2. Zoom is more difficult to use for the presenter than it needs to be. We did better with these sessions, but if you have a conflict and can't come in person or try to watch playback you are taking a big risk.

3. None

6. None

7. n/a

8. Mon section questions

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

1. Some guest lecturers. Mentioning how this impacts business in general.

2. Some sort of standardization for inclusion of links in Canvas, setup of machines and ability to see questions on a separate computer during presenter mode. This is making it too complicated for the instructors/TAs. Setup another pc/ipad something to login to zoom and 'watch' the question stream.

6. Dmitri was very helpful with concepts

7. n/a

8. Would've been good to get personalized answers to essay questions. Also, sometimes quiz questions seemed like it could have multiple answers and I later learnt that students would go uptown the TA and get points for their incorrect answer by convincing the TA. However, other students who had the same incorrect answer didn't get the points.

10. it was all good

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.

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 A
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Other

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 17/35 (49% 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
4.8	**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: 5.7
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	17	65%	29%	6%				4.7	4.6
The content of the quiz section was:	17	71%	18%	12%				4.8	4.7
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	4.6
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	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:	17	35%	29%	12%	24%				6.0
The intellectual challenge presented was:	17	35%	41%	12%	12%				6.1
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	17	35%	41%	12%	12%				6.1
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	17	35%	41%	12%	12%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	17	41%	35%	12%	12%				6.2

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: 6.9 Hours per credit: 1.7 (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%		24%	29%	29%	6%	6%					

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education? **Class median: 6.7 Hours per credit: 1.7 (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%		24%	35%	24%	6%	6%					

What grade do you expect in this course? **Class median: 3.9 (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
53%	35%	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
41%	12%			47%	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem — The Course Evaluation Standard

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	53%	41%	6%				4.6	15
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	17	65%	29%	6%				4.7	7
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	17	53%	41%	6%				4.6	17
QSI's enthusiasm was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	14
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	16
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	17	65%	29%	6%				4.7	13
Answers to student questions were:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	5
Interest level of quiz sections was:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	2
QSI's openness to student views was:	17	65%	29%	6%				4.7	12
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	11
Availability of extra help when needed was:	17	65%	24%	12%				4.7	8
Use of quiz section time was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	1
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	18
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	6
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	10
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	17	65%	29%	6%				4.7	3
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	17	59%	35%	6%				4.7	9
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	17	71%	24%	6%				4.8	4

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
Foster School of Business
Business Administration
Term: Summer 2018

IASystem
The Course Evaluation Standard

TMMBA 507 A
Analysis Of Domestic And International Econ Conds
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Debra Glassman, Dmitry Brizhatyuk
Instructor Evaluated: Dmitry Brizhatyuk-Other

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

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. Yes the student reviews very extremely valuable and prepared me for quizzes and essays

3. Absolutely stretched my thinking.

5. Yes, Dmitry's explanations were clear and concise. Which helps greatly in a subject where it's easy to get confused with all the terminologies.

6. TA did a good job of articulating the core macro concepts effectively

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

1. Dmitry was very helpful and responsive in answering questions. The review sessions were well structured.

2. Review sessions

3. Dmitry was fantastic in class. He was amazing in responding to email queries and made sure my doubts were resolved by personally reaching out to me after class if something wasn't clear during the review sessions.

5. The slides since they were very informational.

6. Quiz content was good and stretched my thinking ability

7. Great enthusiasm. Well organized.

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. N/A

4. some of the multiple choice questions are really tricky some of the required materials are only covered in TA sessions (this also made TA sessions very useful)

5. Too many questions from the audience.

6. nothing

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. None

5. Perhaps consider which questions are worth answering during the review session and take less-relevant questions after the session is over.

6. More case studies based on historical events

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.