

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F  
Responses: 23/43 (53% high)

Taught by: Rafia Nisat

**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

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

| Combined Median       | Adjusted Combined Median |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.5                   | 4.7                      |
| (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: 4.8</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 quiz section as a whole was:                                      | 23 | 52%           | 13%           | 30%      | 4%       |          |               | 4.5    | 4.8             |
| The content of the quiz section was:                                  | 23 | 52%           | 13%           | 35%      |          |          |               | 4.5    | 4.7             |
| The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was: | 23 | 52%           | 26%           | 22%      |          |          |               | 4.5    | 4.7             |
| The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:           | 23 | 43%           | 30%           | 22%      | 4%       |          |               | 4.3    | 4.5             |

### 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:                               | 23 | 9%              | 17% | 26% | 30%         | 17% |     |                | 4.6    |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 23 | 9%              | 35% | 22% | 30%         | 4%  |     |                | 5.2    |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 23 | 9%              | 39% | 22% | 17%         | 13% |     |                | 5.4    |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 23 | 13%             | 39% | 26% | 9%          | 13% |     |                | 5.6    |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 23 | 22%             | 30% | 30% | 13%         | 4%  |     |                | 5.6    |

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: 6.6 (N=23)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 4%      | 17% | 9%  | 35% | 13% |       | 13%   | 4%    |       | 4%    |       |            |

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

**Class median: 5.1 (N=23)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 4%      | 17% | 35% | 13% | 4%  | 9%    | 4%    | 9%    | 4%    |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=23)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 39%         | 26%          | 9%           | 4%          | 9%           |              | 4%          | 4%           |              |             |              |         | 4%   |        |           |

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

**(N=23)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 39%           | 30%                             | 4%          |               | 13%                   | 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 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Explanations by the QSI were:                             | 23 | 43%              | 26%                 | 26%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.2    | 15               |
| QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:              | 23 | 48%              | 39%                 | 9%          | 4%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 11               |
| Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:       | 23 | 52%              | 35%                 | 13%         |             |             |                     | 4.5    | 6                |
| QSI's enthusiasm was:                                     | 22 | 41%              | 36%                 | 18%         | 5%          |             |                     | 4.2    | 18               |
| Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:                | 22 | 45%              | 32%                 | 9%          | 9%          | 5%          |                     | 4.4    | 17               |
| Encouragement given students to express themselves was:   | 23 | 52%              | 30%                 | 4%          | 9%          | 4%          |                     | 4.5    | 14               |
| Answers to student questions were:                        | 23 | 43%              | 30%                 | 22%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.3    | 16               |
| Interest level of quiz sections was:                      | 23 | 48%              | 22%                 | 17%         | 13%         |             |                     | 4.4    | 4                |
| QSI's openness to student views was:                      | 22 | 55%              | 23%                 | 23%         |             |             |                     | 4.6    | 10               |
| QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:      | 23 | 48%              | 35%                 | 13%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.4    | 13               |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:               | 23 | 61%              | 22%                 | 17%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 1                |
| Use of quiz section time was:                             | 23 | 52%              | 26%                 | 17%         |             | 4%          |                     | 4.5    | 2                |
| QSI's interest in whether students learned was:           | 23 | 52%              | 26%                 | 13%         | 4%          | 4%          |                     | 4.5    | 9                |
| Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:              | 23 | 43%              | 35%                 | 13%         | 9%          |             |                     | 4.3    | 12               |
| Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:    | 23 | 52%              | 35%                 | 9%          | 4%          |             |                     | 4.5    | 7                |
| Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:      | 23 | 52%              | 17%                 | 26%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.5    | 3                |
| Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:     | 23 | 57%              | 22%                 | 17%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.6    | 5                |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 23 | 52%              | 26%                 | 13%         | 9%          |             |                     | 4.5    | 8                |

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

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F  
Responses: 23/43 (53% high)

Taught by: Rafia Nisat

**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

1. Yeah, it was pretty stimulating. It pushed me to think in ways I wasn't used to, especially when applying concepts instead of just memorizing.
2. yes, I did not have much knowledge of microeconomy before this class.
3. Not really, the things we learned in class were very easy to understand, but outside the class, it was a lot more complicated and completely different from it, so then I had to stretch my thinking
4. Yes. I had to think in this class but it wasn't too hard.
5. Yes, it gave me the opportunity to practice the math problems I didn't understand during my actual lecture.
6. The class was good in terms of being intellectually stimulating. I didn't think it stretched my thinking much because I felt like a lot of it was usage of formulas and using those values to interpret results.
7. Yes, this class was intellectually stimulating as it combined both critical and mathematical skills.
8. Yes because the instructor let us try doing problems by our selves sometimes. the writing assignment also makes us use critical thinking skills.
9. I found the profferer not helpful at all. My Ta, tutor and myself taught me everything I know.
10. Yes it was, Rafia helped us learn the material and make sure we understood it well. If there were any questions that we didn't want to ask in front of anyone she always made it lear when her office hours were and encouraged us to not be shy. She helped me understand things very well, I think I leanred more from quiz section than in the actual lecture.
11. Yes because it was new concepts
12. Yes because it brought up relevant topics.
13. Monopoly law
14. I believe that this class was intellectually stimulating and did stretch my thinking. I took macroeconomics in high school, and while I believe I understood the topic well, this class took a turn in another direction as it was microeconomics. The concepts presented weren't necessarily hard; they just needed some time to process and understand what was going on.
15. Not really - I took Econ in high school.
16. Yes, thinking conceptually about graphs and economic games did make me think more..
17. Somewhat, the class covered what we learned in class but it was all the math that we did not really over in class.
18. it stretch my thinking since I have different ways of thinking a social event
19. He let me know more about economics.
20. Yes I think more in the class.

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

1. The discussions and real-world examples helped the most. They made the material feel relevant instead of abstract.
2. The quiz section
3. When we did in class questions, I feel like I was contributing the most
4. I thought quiz sections were the most helpful for this class.
5. Graphing
6. I liked the writing assignments. Knowing that they played a big role in my grade, it forced me to make sure I took good notes in both the lecture and the quiz section so that I was able to preform well on the writing assignment.
7. The quiz section was mot useful for understanding the content.
8. Doing practice problems
9. idk
10. She was always very thorough about what we were learning. She put it until smple terms and if there was a question she would answer it and give a clear answer. I remember being super shy to g to her office hours but when I finally did have the courage to go she was really welcoming and helped my understand it.
11. Quiz section
12. The quiz sections.
13. Learning more on how firms work
14. I think that the quiz sections/office hours were the most helpful, as it was a smaller classroom and I could get specific help on certain topics.

15. Quiz sections.
16. Going over practice problems and graphs in quiz sections were most helpful.
17. The examples and exercises that we did.
18. it teaches me how to think things in a different way
19. Every chapter of this class has helped me a lot and improved my thinking.
20. Thinking problems.

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

1. Some of the lectures felt a bit fast-paced, so it was hard to keep up at times.
2. The lectures were a bit difficult to discern, and I usually sit at the front of the lecture hall.
3. The very minimal amount of math and equations we learned, as that's what the test and problem sets were mainly on
4. I think sometimes the lectures were confusing and it's hard to get caught up if you miss a lecture.
5. N/A
6. I didn't think there was anything in the class that detracted from my learning.
7. Nothing detracted from learning.
8. going at a fast pace, it takes me longer to process things in general so it was hard for me to understand everything.
9. the professor
10. None, I think this class helped me so much. I don't think I would have gained as much learning experience as I did with this course.
11. Big lectures
12. The lectures were sometimes hard to follow.
13. To much work
14. There was nothing that particularly detracted me from learning, but rather my choice of a 10:00 class wasn't the best choice.
15. Lectures that were repetitive to the textbook.
16. Nothing detracted from my learning.
17. The environment
18. none
19. I think quiz section has greatly influenced me.
20. assignments and classes

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

1. Slowing down during tougher topics and adding more hands-on practice would make the class even better.
2. none.
3. Please make the lecture more engaging with the math portion
5. Less focused on writing assignments (which are basically like mini quizzes), and more on just review/learning the content from the main lectures.
6. Nothing
7. It would be nice if the assignment answer keys showed how to do the problems.
8. If there's a possibility to have two quiz section days in a week, that would be better
9. new professors
10. I would just say to slow down a bit maybe, that was one of the only things I sometimes struggled to keep up with but it wasn't a huge issue.
11. None
12. Improving the lectures.
13. Na
14. I believe the class is pretty good as it is now and doesn't require any major changes.
15. Ensure lectures expand on textbook and do not copy from the textbook.
16. I would have liked more practice problems with answer keys released on canvas (or somewhere else accessible) rather than just our problem sets.
17. Explain more in depth if possible
18. none
19. Very good, there is nothing to improve.
20. No, it's 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.<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.

QMETH 500 A, Joint with QMETH 500 B  
Statistical Data Analysis For Management  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F33  
Responses: 9/48 (19% low)

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

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

| Combined Median       | Adjusted Combined Median |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.7                   | 4.7                      |
| (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: 5.7</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 quiz section as a whole was:                                      | 9 | 56%           | 11%           | 33%      |          |          |               | 4.6    | 4.6             |
| The content of the quiz section was:                                  | 9 | 56%           | 11%           | 33%      |          |          |               | 4.6    | 4.7             |
| The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was: | 9 | 67%           | 22%           | 11%      |          |          |               | 4.8    | 4.7             |
| The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:           | 9 | 67%           | 22%           | 11%      |          |          |               | 4.8    | 4.7             |

### STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

| Relative to other college courses you have taken:                            | N | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|----------------|--------|
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be:                               | 9 | 33%             | 22% | 33% | 11%         |     |     |                | 5.8    |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 9 | 33%             | 44% | 11% | 11%         |     |     |                | 6.1    |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 9 | 22%             | 56% | 22% |             |     |     |                | 6.0    |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 9 | 22%             | 44% | 33% |             |     |     |                | 5.9    |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 9 | 44%             | 33% | 22% |             |     |     |                | 6.3    |

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: 8.5 Hours per credit: 2.1 (N=9)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         |     | 22% | 22% | 11% | 22%   |       | 11%   |       | 11%   |       |            |

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

**Class median: 8.0 Hours per credit: 2 (N=9)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         |     | 22% | 22% | 22% | 11%   |       | 11%   |       | 11%   |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.3 (N=9)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 22%         | 11%          | 33%          | 33%         |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=9)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 22%           | 78%                             |             |               |                       |       |

**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 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Usefulness of review sessions was:                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 9 | 44%              | 33%                 |             | 22%         |             |                     | 4.3    |                  |
| TA's use of examples and illustrations was:                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 9 | 44%              | 44%                 |             | 11%         |             |                     | 4.4    |                  |
| Student confidence in TA's knowledge was:                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 9 | 44%              | 33%                 | 11%         | 11%         |             |                     | 4.3    |                  |
| Answers to student questions were:                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 9 | 44%              | 33%                 | 22%         |             |             |                     | 4.3    | 1                |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 9 | 44%              | 44%                 | 11%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    | 2                |
| TA's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:                                                                                                                                                                                                | 9 | 44%              | 56%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.4    |                  |
| Quality/helpfulness of TA feedback was:                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 9 | 44%              | 56%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.4    |                  |
| The TA's facilitation of an inclusive teaching environment where all types of students (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, socio-economic status, belief systems, age, etc.) felt they belonged and were encouraged to engage was: | 9 | 44%              | 44%                 | 11%         |             |             |                     | 4.4    |                  |

QMETH 500 A, Joint with QMETH 500 B  
Statistical Data Analysis For Management  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F33  
Responses: 9/48 (19% low)

### STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

#### What aspects of review sessions were most helpful to your learning?

1. All sessions were very focused
2. The extra problems
3. I liked her different examples she used, and detailed explanations.
4. Review of learned materials on simple examples. Simplicity made learning efficient and not frustrating with excessive challenge
5. Well organized and executed

#### What aspects of review sessions could be improved?

1. N/A
2. More real world applications?
3. Not sure, maybe more examples?
4. more review sessions could be even more helpful. It would be beneficial to review same tools usage in similar types of problems several times, it does not feel redundant
5. None that I can think of

#### How well did the TA utilize teaching strategies that encourage the learning and growth of students from all backgrounds and life experiences? Please provide specific examples or feedback.

3. N/A
4. Checked regularly if everyone was following. Offered extra time after sessions for individual discussions
5. Awesome job overall. Really knew how to relate to our positionality as people who aren't statisticians.

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.

QMETH 500 C, Joint with QMETH 500 D  
Statistical Data Analysis For Management  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F33  
Responses: 5/42 (12% low)

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

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

| Combined Median       | Adjusted Combined Median |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>4.8</b>            | <b>4.9</b>               |
| (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: 4.9</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 quiz section as a whole was:                                      | 5 | 60%           | 20%           | 20%      |          |          |               | 4.7    | 4.8             |
| The content of the quiz section was:                                  | 5 | 60%           | 20%           | 20%      |          |          |               | 4.7    | 4.8             |
| The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was: | 5 | 80%           |               | 20%      |          |          |               | 4.9    | 5.0             |
| The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:           | 5 | 80%           |               | 20%      |          |          |               | 4.9    | 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:                               | 5 | 20%             | 20% | 40% | 20%         |     |     |                | 5.2    |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 5 | 20%             | 20% | 60% |             |     |     |                | 5.3    |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 5 | 40%             |     | 40% | 20%         |     |     |                | 5.2    |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 5 | 40%             |     | 40% | 20%         |     |     |                | 5.2    |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 5 | 20%             | 60% | 20% |             |     |     |                | 6.0    |

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: 6.5 Hours per credit: 1.6 (N=5)**

| Under 2 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 | 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 | 16-17 | 18-19 | 20-21 | 22 or more |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|         | 20% | 20% | 20% |     | 40%   |       |       |       |       |       |            |

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

**Class median: 3.0 Hours per credit: 0.8 (N=5)**

| Under 2 | 2-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 | 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 | 16-17 | 18-19 | 20-21 | 22 or more |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 20%     | 40% |     | 20% | 20% |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.5 (N=5)**

| 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%         | 40%          | 40%          |             |              |              |             |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=5)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 20%           | 80%                             |             |               |                       |       |

**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 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Usefulness of review sessions was:                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 5 | 60%              |                     | 40%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    |                  |
| TA's use of examples and illustrations was:                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 5 | 60%              | 20%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    |                  |
| Student confidence in TA's knowledge was:                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 5 | 80%              | 20%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.9    |                  |
| Answers to student questions were:                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 5 | 60%              | 20%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    | 1                |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 5 | 40%              | 20%                 | 40%         |             |             |                     | 4.0    | 2                |
| TA's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:                                                                                                                                                                                                | 5 | 60%              | 20%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    |                  |
| Quality/helpfulness of TA feedback was:                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 5 | 60%              | 20%                 | 20%         |             |             |                     | 4.7    |                  |
| The TA's facilitation of an inclusive teaching environment where all types of students (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, socio-economic status, belief systems, age, etc.) felt they belonged and were encouraged to engage was: | 5 | 60%              | 40%                 |             |             |             |                     | 4.7    |                  |

QMETH 500 C, Joint with QMETH 500 D  
Statistical Data Analysis For Management  
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F33  
Responses: 5/42 (12% low)

**STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS****What aspects of review sessions were most helpful to your learning?**

1. Supportive and walked through the examples in a clear, simple way.

**What aspects of review sessions could be improved?**

1. None that I could see

**How well did the TA utilize teaching strategies that encourage the learning and growth of students from all backgrounds and life experiences? Please provide specific examples or feedback.**

1. Answered all questions and remained patient.

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.

QMETH 510 A  
Probability And Statistics  
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F16  
Responses: 55/76 (72% very high)

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

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

| Combined Median       | Adjusted Combined Median |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 4.3                   | 4.4                      |
| (0=lowest; 5=highest) |                          |

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

|                       |
|-----------------------|
| <b>CEI: 5.7</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 quiz section as a whole was:                                      | 55 | 44%           | 33%           | 20%      | 4%       |          |               | 4.3    | 4.4             |
| The content of the quiz section was:                                  | 55 | 42%           | 36%           | 22%      |          |          |               | 4.3    | 4.4             |
| The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was: | 55 | 42%           | 40%           | 13%      | 5%       |          |               | 4.3    | 4.4             |
| The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:           | 55 | 44%           | 38%           | 15%      | 4%       |          |               | 4.3    | 4.4             |

## STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

|                                                                              | N  | Much Higher (7) | (6) | (5) | Average (4) | (3) | (2) | Much Lower (1) | Median |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|-----------------|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|----------------|--------|
| <b>Relative to other college courses you have taken:</b>                     |    |                 |     |     |             |     |     |                |        |
| Do you expect your grade in this course to be:                               | 55 | 24%             | 33% | 16% | 25%         | 2%  |     |                | 5.7    |
| The intellectual challenge presented was:                                    | 55 | 38%             | 33% | 13% | 15%         |     | 2%  |                | 6.1    |
| The amount of effort you put into this course was:                           | 55 | 44%             | 33% | 13% | 9%          |     |     | 2%             | 6.3    |
| The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:                          | 55 | 36%             | 35% | 13% | 15%         |     |     | 2%             | 6.1    |
| Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was: | 55 | 47%             | 20% | 20% | 11%         |     |     | 2%             | 6.4    |

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: 5.2 Hours per credit: 2.6 (N=54)**

| 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 |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 2%      | 11% | 43% | 28% | 7%  | 4%    | 2%    | 2%    |       |       |       | 2%         |

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

**Class median: 4.4 Hours per credit: 2.2 (N=54)**

| 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%      | 28% | 37% | 19% | 7%  | 2%    |       | 2%    |       |       |       |            |

What grade do you expect in this course?

**Class median: 3.7 (N=54)**

| 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 |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------|------|--------|-----------|
| 39%         | 31%          | 22%          | 6%          |              |              | 2%          |              |              |             |              |         |      |        |           |

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

**(N=54)**

| In your major | A core/distribution requirement | An elective | In your minor | A program requirement | Other |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 22%           | 43%                             |             |               | 35%                   |       |

**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 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|------------------|
| Usefulness of Review Sessions were:                       | 55 | 60%              | 20%                 | 11%         | 7%          | 2%          |                     | 4.7    |                  |
| Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was: | 55 | 40%              | 45%                 | 7%          | 7%          |             |                     | 4.3    | 2                |
| TA's use of examples and illustrations was:               | 54 | 50%              | 30%                 | 15%         | 6%          |             |                     | 4.5    |                  |
| Student confidence in TA's knowledge was:                 | 55 | 45%              | 42%                 | 9%          | 2%          | 2%          |                     | 4.4    |                  |
| Answers to student questions were:                        | 55 | 49%              | 25%                 | 20%         | 5%          |             |                     | 4.5    | 1                |
| Availability of extra help when needed was:               | 54 | 43%              | 37%                 | 19%         | 2%          |             |                     | 4.3    | 3                |
| TA's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:    | 55 | 45%              | 31%                 | 20%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.4    |                  |
| Quality/helpfulness of TA feedback was:                   | 55 | 44%              | 33%                 | 18%         | 5%          |             |                     | 4.3    |                  |
| The Teaching Assistant as a whole was:                    | 55 | 44%              | 35%                 | 18%         | 4%          |             |                     | 4.3    |                  |

QMETH 510 A  
Probability And Statistics  
Course type: Hybrid

Evaluation Delivery: Online  
Evaluation Form: F16  
Responses: 55/76 (72% very high)

Taught by: Issariya Sirichakwal, Rafia Nisat  
**Instructor Evaluated: Rafia Nisat-Grad TA**

## STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

### What aspects of review sessions were helpful to your learning?

1. Additional ways to complete problem sets.
2. Supplemental coverage of the core concepts introduced by Issariya and the textbook.
3. This sessions is much focused on problem solving skills and hand-on experience.
4. It was sometimes helpful to see the broken down process of how the calculations were performed. I also enjoyed resonating with the areas that my classmates were also having difficulty navigating.
5. question and answer
6. Having a few more examples was good.
7. It was extremely helpful going through the Excel formulas that were able to help us get the answer to the problems.
8. All of it. I didn't understand anything while going through the textbook, but attending review sessions really helped me understand the material.
9. I enjoyed that you went through practice problems that were similar to the graded quizzes. The review sessions were key, especially when we didn't have a Foster Live session. The reading made no sense until we completed some practice problems. I appreciate that time.
10. Real-world application of the reading was most helpful.
11. Working through problems was extremely helpful. The textbook is obviously theoretical but the review sessions were all application. Really tied everything together.
12. The practice problems were useful in hindsight when I was stuck on a quiz or exam, just being able to see something getting worked through that was similar.
13. Seeing how to use excel
14. The review sessions were perfectly interesting and important to align with the course materials provided by the professor. TA was perfectly professional and perfectly aware about the course contents.
15. The review sessions were really helpful in terms of formulas and steps to achieve a solution, especially while taking the exam. Thank you so much Rafia for your support.
16. since we had limited Foster Live teaching, attending the review sessions was critical for me to see and apply the weekly concepts
17. Rafia is an amazing TA! She was able to demonstrate the topic and extract the essence and communicate clearly during review session. There was a few confusing part I had on regression and she was able to help answer it during review session. Super helpful!
18. Walking through the practice problems to better understand the material was very helpful.
19. Going through example problems was helpful as well as sharing the Excel template.
20. sample questions
21. Application to real world use.
22. Reviewing problems beginning to end was very helpful
23. The practice problems
24. Practice problems
25. Whenever I thought I needed an additional reinforcement to the concepts learnt, the review sessions came very handy. The problems solved during the session were helpful.
26. More interactions during the sessions can be more helpful.
27. Rafia's demonstration of working through the problems was very helpful, as was her clear and direct communication.
28. Going over the various problem types to solidify my understanding of the new topics presented
29. Reviewing the material through examples
30. It was helpful to see a lot of the knowledge and practice problems in the review sessions being reviewed on actual excel formatting. This helped me navigate using excel better for the quizzes and practice problems. Review sessions often focused on preparing for upcoming exams/quizzes by covering key topics, reviewing past exam questions, and providing tips on how to approach different types of problems. This was very helpful in being able to apply what was learned to the actual problems and knowledge check quizzes.
31. It was very helpful to go through the examples and apply them to real situations.
32. Working through problems together.
33. Reviewing quiz problems and revisiting key course topics.
34. The review sessions covered numerical examples that were extremely useful for the purpose of quizzes and assignments. The TA was very methodical in her approach, did not rush through the steps, adequately explained and answered all questions.

36. The TA went over in detail example problems that were directly relevant to the content being learned. The TA was always willing to slow down or answer any questions.
37. The review sessions were good to help understand problem solving. Professors class was focused on concept learning and review sessions were focused on actual problem solving.
38. Hearing her thought process as she went through each problem was the most impactful for me.
39. Going over examples. The review sessions were perfect. Thank you rafia.

#### What aspects of review sessions could be improved?

1. Delivery. There was limited student interaction in the review sessions.
2. Can't think of any needs for improvement. Review sessions were very effective. You get out of it what you put into it as a student.
3. The main instructor consistently monitored the review sessions, stepping in to address questions that were either outside the scope or beyond the TA's expertise. This practice, which is already in place, significantly enhances the students' learning experience.
4. The review session aligned topically with what we were learning but did not align in its execution of how to solve problems. For people on such a rushed, tight schedule it was difficult to understand what the real process was if the book, the instructor, and the review were all presenting different steps to attaining the solution. I found the book and the review sessions to be equally confusing when compared to the professors teaching.
5. more practice problems
6. TA was very non interactive. It was like watching a youtube video. Plus she didnt come across as confident/knowledgeable and had to refer to the professor for most of the questions.
7. I felt like I learned how to use the Excel formulas really well, but it didn't feel like we had enough time to go through how to pick apart a question and understand what it's asking and how to approach the problem.
8. I felt that going through the quizzes and assignments for the course were fine and I was confident in the material. I thought the final exam was significantly more difficult than what we did throughout the quarter.
10. They could be more engaging and focus more on the Module as a whole, rather than one problem.
12. I didnt really feel a connection with Rafia and it didnt feel super helpful to go to the review sessions live. She definitely seems like she knows what shes doing but it felt a bit rote and not very dynamic.
13. more notes on review session solutions
14. I believe it would be profitable to have some additional time for the review session, especially for people who do not hold a previous statistical background. From the other side, I believe it was hard to manage between weekly modules and the review sessions, especially for working professionals and considering that we are dealing with multiple courses.
15. The review sessions felt more theoretical. Though it helped in answering the questions in exam, explaining more practical usecases during review session will make it more interesting.
16. more engagement with students. but overall very helpful to learn the content
17. N/A
18. Sometimes answers to student questions were unclear.
20. nothing.
21. none
22. N/a
23. More practice problems
25. I like the way they are conducted. However, I downloaded some videos for later use - both review and Foster live. They seem to not play the video (some of them), the audio worked just fine. May be a technical issue that needs to be addressed.
26. It is a great setup. No comments.
27. n/a
28. not sure
29. When going through examples, additional clarification on Why a particular action is taken can improve richness of the review session.
30. I felt as if a lot of the review sessions felt rushed. I believe it would be helpful to have supplemental videos that we can watch before the review sessions to further aid in our understanding of the concepts and material. A lot of the review session was very condensed where it did limit Q&A at times, but it was helpful to have both the professor and TA available outside of class hours and review sessions as well. Maybe also collecting questions anonymously prior to the review session would also help drive what further needs to be discussed during these review sessions as well, or maybe the TA or professor can provide some clarity and answers via a video or rolled up summary of the questions that were asked.
31. I think it was structured well.
32. n/a
33. More examples to review
34. In the hindsight, the main purpose of following the review session was to get through the assignment and quizzes, focused on solving numerical problems. Often the examples we covered did not seem very relevant for the business world. I wish we had some components of case studies that dealt with real world business issues and how to use statistical techniques to generate insights.
36. The TA sometimes could have explained concepts in simpler, clearer terms.
37. More real time case studies will help to connect our learnings to real word problems
38. Sometime I felt that questions that weren't relevant to the problem at hand caused us to lose time during the review session. I think those need to be saved to the end to be respectful of everyone else's time.

39. In addition to review sessions there should be live sessions on concepts covered during that week

#### Any additional comments?

1. None
3. This TA has patience and makes sure to answer questions from students.
4. The TA was very kind to all students.
8. Rafia was a great TA and the examples she had in review sessions were crucial to my understanding of the material
9. Appreciate your time to help us through this course!
10. n/A
12. thanks for your hard work!
14. No additional comments from my end. Thank you for the full support during this quarter and best of luck in your teaching journey.
17. N/A
21. Some modules, it felt like the practice quizzes and the real quiz were not similar enough.
26. It would be great the professor and Rafia could turn the camera on always.
28. n/a
29. Taking additional time to go through examples even when class is silent on questions could help.
30. If there was a way to further enable engagement with peers during review sessions to allow for the exchange of ideas and different perspectives, this would be helpful beyond just our group projects and discussion board posts. Overall, I found the review sessions to be helpful, especially seeing them in real time utilizing excel to find solutions.
31. As I evaluated in the professor's review, I wish the length of this course was longer (10 weeks) in comparison to other courses
32. best review sessions
33. None
34. While Rafia overall did a very nice job, I think it would be great if she is able to engage more with the class during the session. Her focus often remained on writing/annotating on the tablet, so a lot of the times it felt a tad bit mechanical.
35. Due to being on the east coast, I was unable to attend any of the review sessions due to how late they were.
36. None.
37. Thank you for the review sessions, they helped to get an understanding on problem solving
38. Great course and I attended every review session since they were so helpful!

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.