

# eEvaluate Report - Summer 2021

Course: ECON 3113-100

College of Arts and Sciences

Total Enrollment: 17

Section Title: Intermed Microeconomic Theory

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Instructor: Kasra Khademorezaian

Section Size: Small 16-25

Question	Level	Mean Response	Median Response	Standard Deviation	ZScore	Responses	Percent #1	Percent #2	Percent #3	Percent #4	Percent #5	Dept Rank	College Rank
1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	INDIVIDUAL	3.78571	4	0.89258		14	0.00	7.14	28.57	42.86	21.43	33.33	29.55
	DEPARTMENT	4.09524	4	0.88909		21	0.00	4.76	19.05	38.10	38.10		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.09744	4	1.05310	-0.30	195	3.08	6.15	13.85	31.79	45.13		
	COLLEGE	4.13105	4	0.96623	-0.36	2,419	2.07	3.64	17.65	32.41	44.23		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	3.92857	4	1.20667		14	7.14	0.00	28.57	21.43	42.86	33.33	31.82
	DEPARTMENT	4.19048	5	1.07792		21	4.76	0.00	19.05	23.81	52.38		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.25258	5	1.07882	-0.30	194	4.12	4.12	11.34	23.20	57.22		
	COLLEGE	4.34424	5	0.97947	-0.42	2,414	2.36	3.44	12.18	21.46	60.56		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.42857	5	0.75593		14	0.00	0.00	14.29	28.57	57.14	66.67	50.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.45000	5	0.68633		20	0.00	0.00	10.00	35.00	55.00		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.25773	5	1.09429	0.16	194	5.15	2.06	12.89	21.65	58.25		
	COLLEGE	4.22047	5	1.08026	0.19	2,413	3.69	4.60	13.80	21.80	56.11		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.07143	5	1.07161		14	0.00	7.14	28.57	14.29	50.00	33.33	38.64
	DEPARTMENT	4.23810	5	0.94365		21	0.00	4.76	19.05	23.81	52.38		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.23590	5	1.02833	-0.16	195	2.56	4.62	14.36	23.59	54.87		
	COLLEGE	4.28500	5	0.99103	-0.22	2,414	1.95	4.64	13.30	23.20	56.92		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	3.57143	4	1.34246		14	7.14	14.29	28.57	14.29	35.71	33.33	29.55
	DEPARTMENT	3.80952	4	1.24976		21	4.76	9.52	28.57	14.29	42.86		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.03608	5	1.26889	-0.37	194	8.25	5.15	13.40	21.13	52.06		
	COLLEGE	4.13687	5	1.12143	-0.50	2,411	4.06	5.60	15.76	21.73	52.84		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	3.85714	4	1.09945		14	0.00	14.29	21.43	28.57	35.71	33.33	38.64
	DEPARTMENT	4.09524	5	1.04426		21	0.00	9.52	19.05	23.81	47.62		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.13333	5	1.19822	-0.23	195	6.15	5.64	11.79	21.54	54.87		
	COLLEGE	4.17820	5	1.08230	-0.30	2,413	3.32	5.51	14.79	22.79	53.58		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.14286	4	0.86444		14	0.00	0.00	28.57	28.57	42.86	33.33	40.91
	DEPARTMENT	4.38095	5	0.80475		21	0.00	0.00	19.05	23.81	57.14		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.21026	5	1.13151	-0.06	195	5.13	3.59	13.85	20.00	57.44		
	COLLEGE	4.22959	5	1.07759	-0.08	2,413	3.52	4.81	13.63	21.26	56.78		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	4	0.75955		14	0.00	7.14	42.86	42.86	7.14	33.33	30.95
	DEPARTMENT	3.80952	4	0.81358		21	0.00	4.76	28.57	47.62	19.05		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.96859	4	1.00998	-0.46	191	2.62	6.81	16.23	39.79	34.55		
	COLLEGE	4.01888	4	0.93065	-0.56	2,330	1.50	4.29	20.47	38.28	35.45		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.07143	3	0.73005		14	0.00	14.29	71.43	7.14	7.14	33.33	28.57
	DEPARTMENT	3.33333	3	0.85635		21	0.00	9.52	61.90	14.29	14.29		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.51832	3	0.83881	-0.53	191	0.52	4.71	53.40	25.13	16.23		
	COLLEGE	3.57719	3	0.86077	-0.59	2,332	0.86	3.17	52.44	24.44	19.08		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	3	1.09193		14	7.14	0.00	50.00	21.43	21.43	33.33	33.33
	DEPARTMENT	3.76190	4	1.09109		21	4.76	0.00	42.86	19.05	33.33		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.97906	4	1.11901	-0.43	191	4.19	5.24	22.51	24.61	43.46		
	COLLEGE	4.00601	4	1.02250	-0.49	2,329	2.10	5.58	22.58	29.07	40.66		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	3.50000	3	1.09193		14	7.14	0.00	50.00	21.43	21.43	33.33	33.33
	DEPARTMENT	3.80952	4	1.03049		21	4.76	0.00	33.33	33.33	28.57		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.02105	4	1.17270	-0.44	190	5.79	4.74	18.42	23.68	47.37		
	COLLEGE	4.10739	4	1.07700	-0.56	2,328	3.26	5.54	16.97	25.64	48.58		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.71429	5	0.61125		14	0.00	0.00	7.14	14.29	78.57	66.67	33.33
	DEPARTMENT	4.76190	5	0.53896		21	0.00	0.00	4.76	14.29	80.95		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.66492	5	0.72749	0.07	191	0.52	2.09	5.76	13.61	78.01		
	COLLEGE	4.71594	5	0.65083	0.00	2,327	0.52	1.46	3.52	14.91	79.59		

# eValuate Report - Summer 2021

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: ECON 3113-100

Section Title: Intermed Microeconomic Theory

Instructor: Kasra Khademorezaian

Total Enrollment: 17

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

Section Size: Small 16-25

## Question

1. What were the strong points of the course?
2. What were the weak points of the course?
3. What should the instructor do to improve their teaching?
4. What is your overall opinion of this course?

## Comment

1. No busy work assignments

2. A lot of focus on things not included on exam

3. More focus on concepts being tested

4. It was ok

1. I thought his lectures were very effective.

2. The fact that the course was only 4 weeks long attributed to some limitations.

3. Past exams meant for studying purposes would be helpful.

4. Overall, the class was helpful and insightful.

1. he would stay after the lecture to answer questions we had

2. reading off lecture slides that I can read

3. I honestly wouldn't change anything because classes via zoom are hard

4. I very much liked this course and the teacher as well

1. Absolutely nothing

2. N/A

3. Explain more of the analytical questions. Stuff of the exams were different that expected from practice questions.

4. Caused me to get a headache

1. Course material was interesting and often times lecture materials could be covered quickly.

2. Lectures lacked much participation. All of the course grades were based on the exams.

3. There could be some homework grades to help facilitate learning during the lectures. For example, group work or break out rooms over zoom would help to encourage students to learn together and increase participation. This would also better help students prepare for exams.

4. Interesting course, but ultimately all of the learning was independent and led up to the student entirely.

1. Excellent professor

2. The pace and amount of material at the same time

3. N/A

4. Good summer class

1. Professor K did an excellent job of making sure to give the students any clarification when needed. Additionally, his powerpoints were very informative.

2. This course was slightly boring at times, but I think that was more because we had to cram lectures in during the short summer semester.

3. Professor K is doing a great job, but the one thing I would say to improve is give more time to review past concepts.

4. I really enjoyed this course and I am very happy I took it.

1. The practice homework and office hour times available

2. It's just difficult material

3. Include practice tests to help study for the exams

4. Difficult but good course

## eEvaluate Report - Summer 2021

1. Professor was very prompt in returning emails and tests. Definitely a fair grader. The material was taught in an effective manner.

2. Sometimes it was hard to focus on lectures.

3. Release all slides and practice tests at the beginning of the semester.

4. It was very good and I would take it again.

1. Good teaching

2. Homework's

3. Nothing

4. It was good

1. The content we learned.

2. This course could use some sort of tool that allows students to work out the mathematics interactively. Maybe a tool like McGraw Hill or something that provides practice problems.

3. Nothing

4. It was good. I learned a lot in a short amount of time.

# eEvaluate Report - Summer 2021

## Response Key

1. Extent to which the instructor contributed to your learning	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
7. Instructor's management of the course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
8. Amount you learned in this class	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	1 = Far Below Average, 2 = Below Average, 3 = Average, 4 = Above Average, 5 = Far Above Average
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
11. Overall, this course was	1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent
12. This course was graded fairly	1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Occasionally, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always