COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2025

ECON 382 AA
Introduction To Econometrics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Taught by: Tyson Ramirez
Instructor Evaluated: Tyson Ramirez-Grad TA

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 26/38 (68% high)

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

Combined Median	Adjusted Combined Median
4.9	**4.9**
(0=lowest; 5=highest)	

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

CEI: 5.3
(1=lowest; 7=highest)

SUMMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Adjusted Median
The quiz section as a whole was:	26	85%	15%					4.9	4.9
The content of the quiz section was:	26	81%	19%					4.9	4.9
The quiz section instructor's (QSI's) contribution to the course was:	26	88%	12%					4.9	5.0
The QSI's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter was:	26	81%	19%					4.9	4.9

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:	26	15%	12%	31%	27%	8%	4%	4%	4.8
The intellectual challenge presented was:	25	24%	44%	12%	20%				5.9
The amount of effort you put into this course was:	25	36%	12%	32%	20%				5.4
The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	24	38%	29%	25%	8%				6.1
Your involvement in course (doing assignments, attending classes, etc.) was:	25	24%	32%	20%	20%	4%			5.7

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course, including attending classes, doing readings, reviewing notes, writing papers and any other course related work?
Class median: 7.2 (N=24)

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%	21%	29%	17%	21%		4%	4%			

From the total average hours above, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?
Class median: 5.5 (N=24)

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
	8%	42%	17%	17%	8%	4%	4%				

What grade do you expect in this course?
Class median: 3.4 (N=24)

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
17%	29%	29%	12%	4%	4%	4%								

In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as:
(N=24)

In your major	A core/distribution requirement	An elective	In your minor	A program requirement	Other
96%	4%				

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Numeric Responses

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2025

STANDARD FORMATIVE ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	Relative Rank
Explanations by the QSI were:	25	88%	12%					4.9	4
QSI's use of examples and illustrations was:	25	84%	16%					4.9	10
Quality of questions or problems raised by QSI was:	25	84%	16%					4.9	9
QSI's enthusiasm was:	25	92%	8%					5.0	17
Student confidence in QSI's knowledge was:	25	92%	8%					5.0	15
Encouragement given students to express themselves was:	25	84%	4%	12%				4.9	18
Answers to student questions were:	25	80%	20%					4.9	14
Interest level of quiz sections was:	25	72%	20%	8%				4.8	6
QSI's openness to student views was:	25	92%	4%	4%				5.0	13
QSI's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	25	88%	12%					4.9	7
Availability of extra help when needed was:	25	96%		4%				5.0	3
Use of quiz section time was:	25	80%	12%	8%				4.9	8
QSI's interest in whether students learned was:	25	92%	8%					5.0	12
Amount you learned in the quiz sections was:	25	84%	12%	4%				4.9	1
Relevance and usefulness of quiz section content were:	25	92%	8%					5.0	2
Coordination between lectures and quiz sections was:	25	68%	24%	4%	4%			4.8	16
Reasonableness of assigned work for quiz section was:	25	92%	8%					5.0	5
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	25	84%	12%	4%				4.9	11

INSTRUCTOR ADDED ITEMS

	N	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Very Poor (0)	Median	
My instructor's quality of explanations of the course content was:	25	84%	16%					4.9	

	N	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	No Opinion (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Median	
I would take another class from this instructor in the future.	24	92%	8%				5.0	

COURSE SUMMARY REPORT
Student Comments

University of Washington, Seattle
College of Arts and Sciences
Economics
Term: Autumn 2025

ECON 382 AA
Introduction To Econometrics
Course type: Face-to-Face

Evaluation Delivery: Online
Evaluation Form: F
Responses: 26/38 (68% high)

Taught by: Tyson Ramirez
Instructor Evaluated: Tyson Ramirez-Grad TA

STANDARD OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

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

2. Yes, there were many new applications of topics that were difficult and required me to put in a lot of effort to understand.

3. You really have helped the whole class with the topic we were unclear about and confused about. I feel like you really cared for each of the students, and I really appreciate your effort in the class.

4. It was intellectually stimulating. Tyson raised good questions about the material that I had not yet considered which enriched the content for me and allowed me to think deeper about the subject.

5. This class was definitely challenging but it helped me to understand concepts that are very important for my future academic career.

6. yes, it includes math methods and analyzation

7. The quiz sections were much better than the lectures, and the instructor explained things in a much more understandable way.

8. Yes, this course taught me about how to create regressions and how to utilize economic data.

9. Yes this class really stretches my thinking no matter in coding or understanding the content of econometric. I really appreciate Tyson's effort in teaching this quiz section class, and helping us prepare for our midterms and final as well.

10. Yes stretched my thinking and reenforced lecture material well in a simplier fashion

11. Yes, applied statistics to real world scenarios. Developed a perspective of breaking down complex data into manageable bits.

12. Not the class but this instructor was amazing

13. yes

14. Yes, the TA was great at explaining everything

15. Yes, Tyson always gave good conceptual explanations and encouraged intellectual discussion to stretch our thinking.

16. Yes, helped me understand a lot about econometrics

What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning?

2. quiz section review, R-studio walk-throughs, quiz section study guides/review notes

4. Tyson asked the class very insightful questions which worked to expand both conversation and understanding, leading to a more engaging and fulfilling section.

5. The R coding was very helpful to strengthen existing coding knowledge.

6. analyzation of example questions

7. The step-by-step explanations of hypothesis tests, homework explanations, and mathematical proofs.

8. The quiz section contributed most to my learning, the explanations that and visualization given helped to clarify content from the lecture. The R coding lessons were also very helpful and easy to understand.

9. Explanation by Tyson and how he explained student's question. In addition, the way he organize the R code and his lecture slide really help us understand the content easier as well.

10. review sessions and office hours

11. The homework's and TA review packets.

12. My quiz section instructor

13. going to the lectures, Great lecturer

14. You could tell the TA really wanted us to understand and cared about our learning

15. Tyson's quiz sections were by far the most helpful part of the class, including his exam reviews and the way he explained concepts in simpler ways that made it easy to understand. He always answered everyones questions very well and it helped me immensely.

16. The instructor's way of teaching

What aspects of this class detracted from your learning?

2. examples without numerical values

4. NOT TYSON'S FAULT --> Instructor's communication about exam content expectations was poor, leading to Tyson not reviewing content properly before exam (multiple severe gaps in coverage). This led to difficulties in exam prep and meant Tyson's section was less helpful than it could have been around exam time.

5. The algebra was at times overwhelming.

6. lack of interaction

7. nothing from the section.

8. I'm not sure.

9. Nothing

10. clarity on coding use and what specifically ius being asked in the hw and how we have to formulate code in response to it instead of just the basic functions shown

11. NA

12. The other instructor didnt speak english very well

14. I had an accident, but nothing related to class

15. none!

16. None

What suggestions do you have for improving the class?

2. The quiz section was a lot more helpful than the lecture. I wish the time allocation between the two were swapped.

4. I think that Tyson got the hang of this in the second half of the class, but I would suggest thinking about what may confuse students during lecture and focus more heavily on that. EX: During the first half of class many equations were given to us but no variables were explained explicitly in what they represented. Covering stuff like this will make students have a better grasp on the fundamentals, leading to stronger performance overall.

5. Use of more examples with real numbers and values.

6. introduce more interaction with students like asking questions

7. Let Ramirez teach the lectures

8. Sometimes the coding section of the homework had questions that I didn't know how to execute in R, so it would be helpful to coordinate the quiz section R coding section with the homework.

9. No suggestion, really excited to take more class by Tyson in the future!

10. useful examples and things to work through together in quiz section that maybe was glazed over in lecture, which i think he still did well

11. More practice problems, possibly projects.

12. Less memorizing content

14. None

15. none!

16. None

INSTRUCTOR-ADDED OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Given that the quiz section is only 50 minutes long, do you have any suggestions for how the instructor could maximize use of this short time?

1. N/A

2. The instructor was timely and efficient. Did a good job posting content after the quiz section and hosting office hours. Personally, I should make sure I have downloaded the R-data before coming to class to help myself be more efficient.

4. N/A well done.

5. Work on examples that explain class content.

6. more analyzation of homework questions and lecture questions

7. no, he did a great job

8. The instructor used the quiz section time very well, I do not have any suggestions.

9. No, he maximize it perfectly

10. I understand he had a class right before, but maybe posting the slide deck that morning rather than at the start of quiz section

11. He did an awesome job. Keep it up

12. nope he did very well

14. He did great!

15. I think he already did a great job of maximizing the time so no feedback really.

16. None

IASystem Course Summary Reports summarize student ratings of a particular course or combination of courses. They provide a rich perspective on student views by reporting responses in three ways: as frequency distributions, average ratings, and either comparative or adjusted ratings. Remember in interpreting results that it is important to keep in mind the number of students who evaluated the course relative to the total course enrollment as shown on the upper right-hand corner of the report.

Frequency distributions. The percentage of students who selected each response choice is displayed for each item. Percentages are based on the number of students who answered the respective item rather than the number of students who evaluated the course because individual item response is optional.

Median ratings. *IASystem* reports average ratings in the form of item medians. Although means are a more familiar type of average than medians, they are less accurate in summarizing student ratings. This is because ratings distributions tend to be strongly skewed. That is, most of the ratings are at the high end of the scale and trail off to the low end.

The median indicates the point on the rating scale at which half of the students selected higher ratings, and half selected lower. Medians are computed to one decimal place by interpolation.[1] In general, higher medians reflect more favorable ratings. To interpret median ratings, compare the value of each median to the respective response scale: *Very Poor, Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent (0-5); Never/None/Much Lower, About Half/Average, Always/Great/Much Higher (1-7); Slight, Moderate, Considerable, Extensive (1-4).*

Comparative ratings. *IASystem* provides a normative comparison for each item by reporting the decile rank of the item median. Decile ranks compare the median rating of a particular item to ratings of the same item over the previous two academic years in all classes at the institution and within the college, school, or division. Decile ranks are shown only for items with sufficient normative data.

Decile ranks range from 0 (lowest) to 9 (highest). For all items, higher medians yield higher decile ranks. The 0 decile rank indicates an item median in the lowest 10% of all scores. A decile rank of 1 indicates a median above the bottom 10% and below the top 80%. A decile rank of 9 indicates a median in the top 10% of all scores. Because average ratings tend to be high, a rating of "good" or "average" may have a low decile rank.

Adjusted ratings. Research has shown that student ratings may be somewhat influenced by factors such as class size, expected grade, and reason for enrollment. To correct for this, *IASystem* reports **adjusted medians** for summative items (items #1-4 and their combined global rating) based on regression analyses of ratings over the previous two academic years in all classes at the respective institution. If large classes at the institution tend to be rated lower than small classes, for example, the adjusted medians for large classes will be slightly higher than their unadjusted medians.

When adjusted ratings are displayed for summative items, **relative rank** is displayed for the more specific (formative) items. Rankings serve as a guide in directing instructional improvement efforts. The top ranked items (1, 2, 3, etc.) represent areas that are going well from a student perspective; whereas the bottom ranked items (18, 17, 16, etc.) represent areas in which the instructor may want to make changes. Relative ranks are computed by first standardizing each item (subtracting the overall institutional average from the item rating for the particular course, then dividing by the standard deviation of the ratings across all courses) and then ranking those standardized scores.

Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI). Several *IASystem* items ask students how academically challenging they found the course to be. *IASystem* calculates the average of these items and reports them as a single index. *The Challenge and Engagement Index (CEI)* correlates only modestly with the global rating (median of items 1-4).

Optional Items. Student responses to instructor-supplied items are summarized at the end of the evaluation report. Median responses should be interpreted in light of the specific item text and response scale used (response values 1-6 on paper evaluation forms).

---

[1] For the specific method, see, for example, Guilford, J.P. (1965). Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, pp. 49-53.