

eEvaluate Report - Summer 2019

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: ECON 3113-100

Section Title: Intermed Microeconomic Theory

Instructor: Amir Tayebi

Total Enrollment: 22

Course Level: Upper 3000 - 4000

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	4.38095	5	0.66904		21	0.00	0.00	9.52	42.86	47.62	20.00	54.84
	DEPARTMENT	4.63265	5	0.56620		49	0.00	0.00	4.08	28.57	67.35		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29201	5	0.90890	0.10	363	1.38	3.31	12.67	30.03	52.62		
	COLLEGE	4.18861	4	0.93792	0.21	2,704	1.63	3.81	15.13	32.95	46.49		
2. Ability of the instructor to respond to a wide range of questions about the material in this course	INDIVIDUAL	4.33333	5	0.79582		21	0.00	0.00	19.05	28.57	52.38	20.00	37.10
	DEPARTMENT	4.61224	5	0.70167		49	0.00	0.00	12.24	14.29	73.47		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.47383	5	0.88963	-0.16	363	1.38	3.03	9.64	18.73	67.22		
	COLLEGE	4.36185	5	0.95886	-0.03	2,700	1.93	3.85	11.30	21.96	60.96		
3. Instructor's promptness in returning exams and assignments so they could be useful for learning	INDIVIDUAL	4.61905	5	0.66904		21	0.00	0.00	9.52	19.05	71.43	20.00	53.23
	DEPARTMENT	4.74468	5	0.60678		47	0.00	0.00	8.51	8.51	82.98		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.39444	5	0.91717	0.24	360	1.11	3.89	11.67	21.11	62.22		
	COLLEGE	4.27671	5	1.04687	0.33	2,696	2.97	4.78	12.61	20.88	58.75		
4. Instructor's ability to encourage critical and independent thinking	INDIVIDUAL	4.28571	5	0.78376		21	0.00	0.00	19.05	33.33	47.62	20.00	41.94
	DEPARTMENT	4.59184	5	0.67449		49	0.00	0.00	10.20	20.41	69.39		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.33978	5	0.91040	-0.06	362	1.66	3.04	11.05	28.18	56.08		
	COLLEGE	4.27360	5	0.98108	0.01	2,701	2.15	4.15	12.85	25.92	54.94		
5. Instructor's ability to stimulate continuing interest in the subject matter	INDIVIDUAL	4.00000	4	0.94868		21	0.00	4.76	28.57	28.57	38.10	20.00	35.48
	DEPARTMENT	4.42857	5	0.84163		49	0.00	2.04	16.33	18.37	63.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.26171	5	1.03280	-0.25	363	3.03	3.58	14.60	21.76	57.02		
	COLLEGE	4.18660	5	1.08046	-0.17	2,701	3.55	4.85	14.88	22.81	53.91		
6. Overall instructor's teaching effectiveness was	INDIVIDUAL	4.35000	5	0.74516		20	0.00	0.00	15.00	35.00	50.00	20.00	48.39
	DEPARTMENT	4.58333	5	0.64687		48	0.00	0.00	8.33	25.00	66.67		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.29282	5	1.01915	0.06	362	2.49	3.87	14.92	19.34	59.39		
	COLLEGE	4.22193	5	1.05940	0.12	2,699	3.22	4.85	13.56	23.23	55.13		
7. Instructor's management of the course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.38095	5	0.74001		21	0.00	0.00	14.29	33.33	52.38	20.00	50.00
	DEPARTMENT	4.65306	5	0.59690		49	0.00	0.00	6.12	22.45	71.43		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.32964	5	0.98287	0.05	361	2.22	4.16	11.36	22.99	59.28		
	COLLEGE	4.23575	5	1.04876	0.14	2,702	2.96	5.14	12.77	23.61	55.51		
8. Amount you learned in this class	INDIVIDUAL	4.09524	4	0.83095		21	0.00	0.00	28.57	33.33	38.10	20.00	43.10
	DEPARTMENT	4.34694	5	0.80496		49	0.00	2.04	14.29	30.61	53.06		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.14869	4	0.88095	-0.06	343	0.87	3.21	17.49	37.03	41.40		
	COLLEGE	4.10956	4	0.90237	-0.02	2,574	1.17	3.07	19.62	35.94	40.21		
9. Workload of this course compared to others a similar level	INDIVIDUAL	3.66667	3	0.96609		21	0.00	4.76	52.38	14.29	28.57	20.00	58.62
	DEPARTMENT	3.87755	4	1.01309		49	0.00	4.08	44.90	10.20	40.82		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.62682	3	0.91164	0.04	343	0.58	4.96	48.69	22.74	23.03		
	COLLEGE	3.60739	3	0.88032	0.07	2,570	0.54	4.44	49.49	24.79	20.74		
10. Quality of readings and/or assigned course materials	INDIVIDUAL	4.19048	5	0.92839		21	0.00	0.00	33.33	14.29	52.38	20.00	60.35
	DEPARTMENT	4.40816	5	0.83960		49	0.00	0.00	22.45	14.29	63.27		
	SIMILAR_COL	3.95614	4	1.03932	0.23	342	2.63	4.97	25.44	28.07	38.89		
	COLLEGE	3.93232	4	1.01587	0.25	2,571	1.91	6.53	24.15	31.23	36.17		
11. Overall, this course was	INDIVIDUAL	4.14286	4	0.79282		21	0.00	0.00	23.81	38.10	38.10	20.00	48.28
	DEPARTMENT	4.44898	5	0.70891		49	0.00	0.00	12.24	30.61	57.14		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.20408	5	1.04534	-0.06	343	2.33	5.25	16.62	21.28	54.52		
	COLLEGE	4.15517	4	1.03455	-0.01	2,565	2.65	5.07	15.83	27.02	49.43		
12. This course was graded fairly	INDIVIDUAL	4.90476	5	0.43644		21	0.00	0.00	4.76	0.00	95.24	60.00	67.24
	DEPARTMENT	4.89796	5	0.42056		49	0.00	0.00	4.08	2.04	93.88		
	SIMILAR_COL	4.64723	5	0.72207	0.36	343	0.29	2.62	4.96	16.33	75.80		
	COLLEGE	4.70027	5	0.64951	0.31	2,559	0.39	1.48	3.79	16.37	77.96		

eEvaluate Report - Summer 2019

College of Arts and Sciences

Course: ECON 3113-100

Section Title: Intermed Microeconomic Theory

Instructor: Amir Tayebi

Total Enrollment: 22

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. instructor is care of students. The lecture and study materials are detailed.

2.

3.

4. Good

1. Professor Tayebi possesses a wide knowledge of microeconomics so he was always able to answer questions clearly and concisely

2. Major grades are the tests so if one doesn't do well on a test it affects them greatly

3. Not sure

4. I enjoyed this course and thought it was presented well for a summer session

1.

2.

3.

4. Overall, it was a good course

1. Lectures online

2. boring course

3. try to be more engaging

4. good summer course

1. Thorough material

2. long lecturing

3. make class more engaging

4. I liked it, hard to listen to a lecture for 2 hours straight though.

1. I think it was taught extremely well. The professor was super helpful in all areas.

2. Too long of lectures.

3. I think he could add more interactive videos.

4. I learned a lot-way more than I thought I would

1. It was 4 weeks so it was over quick, grading was generous and sensible given the timeline. The material covered was also sensible for the 4 weeks. I felt the class did a good job narrowing the material to cover it in 4 weeks.

2. It was 4 weeks. Just not enough time to cover a course.

3. Tends to focus too much on areas that are not relevant to our grade. I know learning is what is promoted, but at the end of the day, all that matters is the grade. From your own words, we won't remember this stuff in a few months so putting a focus on learning instead of the grade after telling us we will all forget anyway is demotivating. Grades stick with you.

4. It was good for what it was. Don't have 4-week courses offered in which covering that much material is difficult.

1. We learned alot in many different areas of microeconomics

2. There were no weak points in this course

3. He was perfectly adept

4. It was great

eEvaluate Report - Summer 2019

1. I liked how the only grades that were issued were tests and one paper

2.

3.

4.

1. Effectiveness of critical thinking

2.

3.

4. Good course

1. Amir really makes sure that we understand before moving forward

2.

3.

4.

1. Professor Tayebi actually worked out examples with us and made sure we understood what was going on.

2. It is lecture heavy and I get why. There's no real way you could make it hands on but it was difficult trying to pay attention.

3. Maybe don't tell people not to worry about grades and alluding to the possibility of you curving our final grades all for you to say that you're not going to do anything and regardless of how we do, we should be proud. It's kind of a one-two punch that every economics professor at this university likes to deliver and it's really stressful.

Other than that, engage the students more. Randomly call on students to go up to the whiteboard and work out a problem and if they get it right they get the full extra credit point and if they don't they just get half credit.

4. Good but dreary.

1. Tests and review

2. Written essay

3.

4.

1. perfect

2. nothing

3. nothing

4. 100

1.

2.

3.

4. fair

1. Provide material clearly!

2. Speed is a little bit fast

3. Both are good

4.

1. reviews before the test

2. Some of the multiple choice questions were vague on exams

3. give more real life examples

4. hated the course when it first started but now I've taking a liking to it.

eEvaluate Report - Summer 2019

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