

ECO 11 003 A-W: Haus Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post

Veronika Dolar Professor Autumn 2011

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

	E-Evallant: VG-Vary Cood: C-Cood: E-Eain R-Daan VR-	/ami Baan		PE	RCE	NTAC	SES 1			
	E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=\	ery Poor	E	VG	G	F	P	VP	MEDIAN	
	Respo	ondents	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1.	The course as a whole was:	33	21	52	21	6			3.9	4.5
2.	The course content was:	33	18	45	27	9			3.8	4.3
3.	The instructor's contribution to the course was:	34	50	35	9	6			4.5	5.0
4.	The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	34	35	50	9	6			4.2	4.7
	COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	134	31	46	16	7			4.1	4.6
										Relative Rank
5.	Course organization was:	34	44	41	15				4.4	6
6	Sequential presentation of concepts was:	33	36	45	15	3			4.2	12
7.	Explanations by instructor were:	34	41	41	12	6			4.3	8
8.	Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	33	33	48	12	6			4.2	13
9.	Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	33	42	39	15	3			4.3	11
10.	Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	33	30	55	12	3			4.1	15
11.	Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	33	27	55	15	3			4.1	16
12.	Instructor's enthusiasm was:	34	71	21	6	3			4.8	1
13.	Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	33	45	42	9	3			4.4	9
14.	Answers to student questions were:	34	32	59	6	3			4.2	14
15.	Availability of extra help when needed was:	32	34	44	19	3			4.1	18
16.	Use of class time was:	33	30	58	9	3			4.2	17
17.	Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	33	64	27	6	3			4.7	4
18.	Amount you learned in the course was:	33	30	61	6	3			4.2	10
19.	Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	33	42	45	9	3			4.3	5
20.	Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	34	53	29	12	6			4.6	3
21.	Reasonableness of assigned work was:	34	47	35	12	6			4.4	7
22.	Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	34	56	38	3	3			4.6	2
			Much Highe		Avera	ane	Much			
Re	ative to other college courses you have taken:			(6) (5		(3)	(2)			
23.	Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	33	AND SOMEON SOURCES	27 1	METERS INCHES (NO.	OF STREET, STR			5.1	
24.	The intellectual challenge presented was:	33	150013013010005142000051	45 2	CARRIENTANCE	3			5.8	
MINISTRAL	The amount of effort you put into this course was:	34	minomore & detains	50 1	NORTHERN MAKES	12			5.9	
	The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	34		47 1	200000000000000000000000000000000000000	6			5.8	
27.	Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	34		44 1					6.0	

28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	 In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent
Percent 3 Under 2	Percent	19 A (3.9-4.0) 25 A- (3.5-3.8)	32 In your major 6 A distribution requiremen
21 2-3	6 Under 2 12 2-3	19 B+ (3.2-3.4)	6 An elective
42 4-5	55 4-5	22 B (2.9-3.1) 3 B- (2.5-2.8)	6 In your minor
15 6-7	9 6-7	3 B- (2.5-2.8) C+ (2.2-2.4)	45 A program requirement
9 8-9	3 8-9	9 C (1.9-2.1)	3 Other
9 10-11	15 10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)	
12-13	12-13	3 D+ (1.2-1.4)	
14-15	14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	Ob all
16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge and
18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Engagement Index
20-21	20-21	Pass	CEI = 5.4
22 or more	22 or more	Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)
Respondents: 33	Respondents: 33	No Credit	(1 lewest, 7 liightest)
Class median: 4.7	Class median: 4.7	Respondents: 32	
Hours per credit: 1.6	Hours per credit: 1.6	Class median: 3.4	

AU11:01891 SURVEY ID Respondents: 34 Enrollment: 44 Classes: 1



Mailbox: ChairCopy? No printed: 3/5/2012



ECO 12 006 - FYO; Tu, Th Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post

Veronika Dolar Professor Autumn 2011

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

	E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=Very Poor				RCE G	NTAG F	ES 1	VP	MEDIAN	
	Respo	ondents	E (5)	VG (4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1.	The course as a whole was:	15	13	53	20	7	7		1 3.8 1	4.2
2	The course content was:	15	13	53	20	13			3.8	4.2
3.	The instructor's contribution to the course was:	15	27	47	27				4.0	4.3
4.	The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	15	33	33	13	13	7		4.0	4.3
	COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	60	22	47	20	8	3		3.9	4.2
										Relative Rank
5	Course organization was:	15	27	53	13	7			4.1	5
6	Sequential presentation of concepts was:	15	27	47	20	7			4.0	11
7	Explanations by instructor were:	15	33	33	13	13		7	4.0	6
8	Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	15	47	13	20	13		7	4.3	1
9	Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	15	33	33	13	7	13	KI SI	4.0	14
10	Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	15	20	47	20	7	7		3.9	15
11	Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	15	20	47	20	13			3.9	16
12	Instructor's enthusiasm was:	15	47	53					4.4	8
13	Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	14	29	50	14			7	4.1	7
14	Answers to student questions were:	15	33	33	27		7		4.0	12
15	Availability of extra help when needed was:	15	33	47	13	7			4.1	9
16	Use of class time was:	15	27	60	7	7			4.1	10
17.	Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	15	47	33	7	13			4.4	2
18.	Amount you learned in the course was:	15	27	47	20	7			4.0	4
19.	Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	15	13	60	27				3.9	13
20.	Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	15	33	47		7	13		4.1	3
21.	Reasonableness of assigned work was:	15	13	60	7	20			3.9	18
22.	Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	15	27	47	7	13	7		4.0	17
			Much Highe		Avera		Much Lower			
Re	ative to other college courses you have taken:				5) (4)			1)		
23.	Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	15	NAME AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE	27 1	CALL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS.	13	NAMES OF TAXABLE PARTY.	7	5.3	
24.	The intellectual challenge presented was:	15	granda and a state of the state	33 2	20000000000				5.8	
	The amount of effort you put into this course was:	15	13	60 1	3 13				5.9	
	The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	15	Ingridigation and a second	33 2	0 13	7			5.8	
27.	Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	15	20	33 2	0 27				5.6	

hours pe	age, how many er week have you n this course?	spent, ho consider	total average hours bw many do you were valuable in g your education?	30. What grant expect in Percent	n this course?	3.55 (49° 12° C) (1557 (19° 24° 24° 11° 11° 11° 11° 11° 11° 11° 11° 11° 1	d to your academic , is this course best ed as:
Percent		Percent		13 13	A (3.9-4.0) A- (3.5-3.8)	47	In your major
	Under 2		Under 2	20	CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE P	27	A distribution requiremen
27	2-3	33	2-3	27	B (2.9-3.1)		An elective
33	4-5	27	4-5	7	B- (2.5-2.8)		In your minor
7	6-7	13	6-7	13	C+ (2.2-2.4)	20	A program requirement
7	8-9		8-9		C (1.9-2.1)	7	Other
	10-11	13	10-11		C- (1.5-1.8)		
13	12-13	13	12-13		D+ (1.2-1.4)		
13	14-15		14-15		D (0.9-1.1)		
	16-17		16-17		D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge	
	18-19		18-19		E (0.0)	Engageme	ent Index
	20-21		20-21		Pass	CEI = 5.4	
	22 or more		22 or more		Credit		7-L:-b4)
Respo	ndents: 15	Pesno	ndents: 15		No Credit	(1=lowest;	7=highest)
THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE	nedian: 4.9		nedian: 4.8	Da			
A STATE OF STREET	r credit: 1.6	THE RESERVE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF	credit: 1.6		ondents: 15 median: 3.1		



ECO 46 001 Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post 7605

Veronika Dolar Professor Autumn 2011

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=Ve	ery Poor			NO DESCRIPTION	NTAC	SES 1		MEDIAN	
		E	VG	G	F	Р	VP	MEDIAN	
Respon	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY IN	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1. The course as a whole was:	2	50	50					4.5	4.4
2. The course content was:	2	50	50		a sing			4.5	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	2	50	50					4.5	4.4
The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	2	50	50					4.5	4.5
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	8	50	50					4.5	4.4
						100000			Relative Rank
5. Course organization was:	2	50	50					4.5	10
6. Sequential presentation of concepts was:	2	50	50					4.5	11
7. Explanations by instructor were:	2	50	50					4.5	12
Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	2	50	50					4.5	13
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	1	100						5.0	6
10. Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	2	100				BRA.		5.0	5
11. Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	2	100						5.0	1
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	2	50	50					4.5	18
13. Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	2	100						5.0	9
14. Answers to student questions were:	2	50	50					4.5	14
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	2	100						5.0	8
16. Use of class time was:	2	50	50					4.5	16
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	2	50	50					4.5	17
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	2	100						5.0	3
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	2	100						5.0	2
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	2	100						5.0	7
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	2	50	50					4.5	15
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	2	100						5.0	4
		Much Highe		Aver	age	Much			
Relative to other college courses you have taken:		(7)) (3)				
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	2	and a supplemental state of	50 50	prideman estimatori				5.5	
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	2	1	00					6.0	
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	2	50	50)		HEAD		6.0	
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	2	mananes es unam	50	10.75				6.5	
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	2	50	50)		HEN		6.0	

hours pe	age, how many er week have you this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent
Percent		Percent	50 A (3.9-4.0) A- (3.5-3.8)	100 In your major
	Under 2	Under 2	50 B+ (3.2-3.4)	A distribution requiremen
	2-3	2-3	B (2.9-3.1)	An elective
50	4-5	50 4-5	B- (2.5-2.8)	In your minor
	6-7	6-7	C+ (2.2-2.4)	A program requirement
	8-9	8-9	C (1.9-2.1)	Other
	10-11	10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)	
50	12-13	50 12-13	D+ (1.2-1.4)	
	14-15	14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	Challange and
	16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge and
	18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Engagement Index
	20-21	20-21	Pass	CEI = 5.8
	22 or more	22 or more	Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)
Respor	ndents: 2	Respondents: 2	No Credit	(1-lowest, 1-llightest)
Class m	nedian: 8.5	Class median: 8.5	Respondents: 2	
Hours per	credit: 2.8	Hours per credit: 2.8	Class median: 3.6	

1. Percentages are based on the number of students who rated each item

AU11:01905 SURVEY ID Respondents: 2 Enrollment: 2 Classes: 1



Mailbox: ChairCopy? No printed: 3/5/2012



ECO 61 001 Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post 1683

Veronika Dolar Professor Autumn 2011

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=V	/am. Daas		PE	RCE	NTA	GES 1			
E-Excellent, VG-Very Good, G-Good, F-Fall, F-Foot, VF-V	rery Poor	E	VG	G	F	P	VP	MEDIAN	
Respo	ondents	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1. The course as a whole was:	33	58	30	12				4.6	4.4
2. The course content was:	33	55	30	12	3			4.6	4.4
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	33	79	12	9				4.9	4.7
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	33	70	15	15				4.8	4.6
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	132	65	22	12	1			4.7	4.5
									Relative Rank
5. Course organization was:	33	70	21	9				4.8	1
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	33	67	18	15				4.8	4
7. Explanations by instructor were:	33	64	24	9	3			4.7	10
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	33	70	21	6	3			4.8	5
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	33	67	24	9				4.8	12
Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	33	67	24	9				4.8	8
Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	33	64	30	6				4.7	2
2. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	33	73	15	12				4.8	15
Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	33	61	33	6				4.7	18
Answers to student questions were:	33	58	33	9				4.6	14
Availability of extra help when needed was:	33	61	33	6				4.7	16
6. Use of class time was:	33	67	27	6				4.8	13
7. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	33	73	24	3				4.8	17
8. Amount you learned in the course was:	33	58	30	9	3			4.6	11
9. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	33	64	24	9			3	4.7	3
Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	33	70	21	9				4.8	9
Reasonableness of assigned work was:	33	67	27	6				4.8	7
Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	33	70	21	6	3			4.8	6
		Much Highe	r	Avera	ae	Much			
elative to other college courses you have taken:			(6) (5			(2)			
Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	33	39	48 6	6				6.3	
The intellectual challenge presented was:	33	52	39 3	3			3	6.5	
5. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	33	58 :	27 9	6				6.6	
6. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	33	58	30 6	3	6			6.6	
77. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	33	64 2	24 6	3	3			6.7	

8. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent
Percent 6 Under 2	<u>Percent</u>	48 A (3.9-4.0) 21 A- (3.5-3.8)	83 In your major
3 2-3	3 Under 2	9 B+ (3.2-3.4)	A distribution requiremen
36 4-5	15 2-3	12 B (2.9-3.1)	An elective
33 6-7	36 4-5	6 B- (2.5-2.8)	In your minor
	21 6-7	C+ (2.2-2.4)	17 A program requirement
	6 8-9	3 C (1.9-2.1)	Other
10-11	10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)	
6 12-13	3 12-13	D+ (1.2-1.4)	
3 14-15	3 14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	Challenge and
16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Engagement Index
18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Lingagement index
20-21	20-21	Pass	CEI = 6.3
9 22 or more	12 22 or more	Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)
Respondents: 33	Respondents: 33	No Credit	(1 lowest, 1 liightest)
Class median: 5.8	Class median: 5.3	Respondents: 33	
Hours per credit: 1.9	Hours per credit: 1.8	Class median: 3.8	

^{1.} Percentages are based on the number of students who rated each item

AU11:01906 SURVEY ID Respondents: 33 Enrollment: 37 Classes: 1



Mailbox: ChairCopy? No printed: 3/5/2012



ECO 11 01FY **Economics** College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post 6413

Veronika Dolar Professor Spring 2012

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

			PE	RCE	NTA	GES 1			
E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=V	ery Poor	E	VG	G	F	P	VP	MEDIAN	
Respo	ondents	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1. The course as a whole was:	14	43	43	7	7			4.3	5.2
2. The course content was:	14	50	21	21	7			4.5	5.3
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	14	71	29					4.8	5.5
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	14	71	29					4.8	5.6
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	56	59	30	7	4			4.7	5.5
									Relative Rank
5. Course organization was:	14	79	21					4.9	1
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	14	64	36					4.7	3
7. Explanations by instructor were:	14	50	43	7				4.5	9
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	14	50	43	7				4.5	10
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	14	57	43					4.6	8
10. Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	14	43	43	14				4.3	14
11. Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	14	36	43	21				4.2	16
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	14	71	29					4.8	6
13. Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	14	50	36	14				4.5	13
14. Answers to student questions were:	14	43	50	7				4.4	15
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	13	23	54	15	8			4.0	18
16. Use of class time was:	13	77	15	8				4.9	4
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	14	64	36					4.7	12
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	14	57	29	7	7			4.6	5
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	14	64	29	7				4.7	2
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	14	50	43		7			4.5	11
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	14	36	57		7			4.3	17
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	14	57 Much	36	7		Much		4.6	7
		Highe		Avera	age	Lowe			
Relative to other college courses you have taken:		(7)	(6) (5	5) (4)	(3)	(2)	(1)		
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	14	7	CONTRACTOR PRODUCTION	36	minches mornes su		7	4.5	
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	14	21	50 1	4 14				5.9	
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	14	14	50 2	1 14				5.8	
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	14	29	50 1	4 7				6.1	
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	14	14	50 1	4 21				5.8	

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	s 30. What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent
Percent Under 2	<u>Percent</u> 8 Under 2	21 A (3.9-4.0) 36 A- (3.5-3.8)	36 In your major 21 A distribution requiremen
15 2-3	8 2-3	7 B+ (3.2-3.4) 21 B (2.9-3.1)	An elective
31 4-5	31 4-5	B- (2.5-2.8)	7 In your minor
15 6-7	8 6-7	7 C+ (2.2-2.4)	36 A program requirement
8 8-9	8-9	7 C (1.9-2.1)	Other
8 10-11	23 10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)	
15 12-13	15 12-13	D+ (1.2-1.4)	The West Committee of the Committee of t
14-15	8 14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	
16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge and
18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Engagement Index
8 20-21	20-21	Pass	CEI = 5.6
22 or more	22 or more	Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)
Respondents: 13	Respondents: 13	No Credit	(1-lowest, 7-flightest)
Class median: 6.0	Class median: 6.5	Respondents: 14	
Hours per credit: 2.0	Hours per credit: 2.2	Class median: 3.5	

SP12:01854



ECO 12 003 Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post 1537 Veronika Dolar Professor Spring 2012

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

	v = 5		PI	RCE	NTA	GES 1			
E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=	very Poor	E	VG	G	F	P	VP	MEDIAN	
Resp	ondents	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)		Adjusted Median
1. The course as a whole was:	29	34	28	28	7	3		3.9	4.5
2. The course content was:	29	31	24	34	3	7		3.7	4.3
3. The instructor's contribution to the course was:	29	55	31	10		3		4.6	5.1
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	29	41	38	14	7			4.3	4.8
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	116	41	30	22	4	3		4.2	4.7
									Relative Rank
5. Course organization was:	29	45	31	14	7	3		4.3	9
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	29	38	34	17	7	3		4.2	14
7. Explanations by instructor were:	29	45	38	14	3			4.4	7
8. Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	29	41	31	17	10			4.2	12
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	29	45	38	10	7			4.4	11
10. Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	29	52	31	10	7			4.5	2
11. Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	29	48	24	10	7	7	3	4.4	3
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	29	69	21	7	3			4.8	1
13. Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	29	55	24	14	7			4.6	4
14. Answers to student questions were:	29	45	31	21	3			4.3	10
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	27	52	11	19	19			4.5	5
16. Use of class time was:	29	45	34	17	3			4.4	13
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	28	61	29	7	4			4.7	6
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	29	31	24	34	10			3.7	17
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	29	34	28	28	7	3		3.9	16
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	29	48	24	17	7	3		4.4	8
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	29	34	17	28	14		7	3.6	18
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	29	41	24	28	7			4.1	15
		Much				Much			
Relative to other college courses you have taken:		Highe		Avera		Lowe			
	00.1	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	NAMES OF TAXABLE PARKETS	5) (4)	sancolnomoutour.	(2)	(1)		
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	29		24 2		4949344157315193		3	5.1	
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	29	190000000000000000000000000000000000000	VALUE OF THE REAL PROPERTY.	4 14	HIGHWAY STREET	and the same of	3	5.5	
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	29	MEMORINA DE SENSON		1 21	meladariiniashia			5.4	
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	29	CONTRACTOR OF STREET	NAMES OF TAXABLE PARTY.	7 10	3		3	5.9	
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	29	34	34 1	0 21				6.1	

On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course?	29. From the total average hours spent, how many do you consider were valuable in advancing your education?	What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	31. In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent
Percent	Percent	31 A (3.9-4.0) 10 A- (3.5-3.8)	38 In your major
Under 2	3 Under 2	21 B+ (3.2-3.4)	10 A distribution requirement
7 2-3	17 2-3	21 B (2.9-3.1)	7 An elective
41 4-5	41 4-5	10 B- (2.5-2.8)	In your minor
28 6-7	10 6-7	3 C+ (2.2-2.4)	38 A program requirement
3 8-9	3 8-9	C (1.9-2.1)	7 Other
7 10-11	3 10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)	
3 12-13	7 12-13	D+ (1.2-1.4)	
7 14-15	3 14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	
16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge and
18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Engagement Index
3 20-21	3 20-21	Pass	CEI = 5.2
22 or more	7 22 or more	Credit	
Respondents: 29	Respondents: 29	3 No Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)
Class median: 5.6	Class median: 4.9	Respondents: 29	
Hours per credit: 1.9	Hours per credit: 1.6	Class median: 3.4	

SP12:01857 SURVEY ID Respondents: 29 Enrollment: 42 Classes: 1 D Form Type Mailbox: ChairCopy? No printed: 8/7/2012



ECO 36 001 Economics College of Lib Arts & Sciences L.I.U. Post Veronika Dolar Professor Spring 2012

INSTRUCTOR COPY

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

E=Excellent; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=V	; VG=Very Good; G=Good; F=Fair; P=Poor; VP=Very Poor				NTAC	Hitreash III		MEDIAN	
Respo	ndents	(5)	VG (4)	G (3)	F (2)	P (1)	VP (0)	WEDIAN	Adjusted Median
The course as a whole was:	16	69	25		6			4.8	4.9
2. The course content was:	16	56	38	6				4.6	4.8
The instructor's contribution to the course was:	16	81	19					4.9	5.0
4. The instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subj. matter was:	16	75	19		6			4.8	5.0
COMBINED ITEMS 1-4	64	70	25	2	3			4.8	4.9
建盟 共享的 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10									Relative Rank
5. Course organization was:	16	62	6	25		6		4.7	4
Sequential presentation of concepts was:	16	69	12	19				4.8	3
7. Explanations by instructor were:	16	62	19	12	6			4.7	12
Instr's ability to present alternative explan, when needed was:	16	69	6	25				4.8	7
Instructor's use of examples and illustrations was:	16	69	25	6				4.8	11
10. Quality of questions or problems raised by the instructor was:	16	69	25	6				4.8	8
11. Contribution of assign. to understanding course content was:	16	62	25	6	6			4.7	2
12. Instructor's enthusiasm was:	16	81	12	6				4.9	9
13. Instructor's ability to deal with student difficulties was:	16	69	19	6	6			4.8	16
14. Answers to student questions were:	16	69	25	6				4.8	6
15. Availability of extra help when needed was:	16	75	19		6			4.8	10
16. Use of class time was:	16	69	25	6				4.8	13
17. Instructor's interest in whether students learned was:	16	69	12	12	6			4.8	17
18. Amount you learned in the course was:	16	62	25	12				4.7	5
19. Relevance and usefulness of course content were:	16	75	12	12				4.8	1
20. Evaluative and grading techniques (tests, papers, etc.) were:	16	62	25	12				4.7	15
21. Reasonableness of assigned work was:	16	44	31	12	12			4.3	18
22. Clarity of student responsibilities and requirements was:	16	62	25	12				4.7	14
		Much Highe		Avera	age	Much Lowe			
Relative to other college courses you have taken:					REGULETIES	(2)	(1)		
23. Do you expect your grade in this course to be:	16	25	CONTRACTOR STATE OF THE PARTY O	9 25	n bedraum transcorp			5.5	
24. The intellectual challenge presented was:	16	31	38 3	1				6.0	
25. The amount of effort you put into this course was:	16	19	31 4	4 6				5.5	
26. The amount of effort to succeed in this course was:	16	12. 2012/10.00000000000000000000000000000000	A MARCON DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF T	2 12				6.5	
27. Your involvement in course (assignments, attendance, etc.) was:	16	38	31 1	inimum managa	6			6.1	

28. On average, how many hours per week have you spent on this course? 29. From the total average spent, how many do your consider were valuable advancing your education.		30. What grade do you expect in this course? Percent	 In regard to your academic program, is this course best described as: Percent 		
Percent	<u>Percent</u>	27 A (3.9-4.0) 27 A- (3.5-3.8)	50 In your major		
12 Under 2 6 2-3	7 Under 2	27 B+ (3.2-3.4)	8 A distribution requiremen		
	27 2-3	7 B (2.9-3.1)	17 An elective		
19 4-5	13 4-5	7 B- (2.5-2.8)	17 In your minor		
25 6-7	27 6-7	C+ (2.2-2.4)	8 A program requirement		
12 8-9	13 8-9	7 C (1.9-2.1)	Other		
12 10-11	10-11	C- (1.5-1.8)			
12-13	12-13	D+ (1.2-1.4)			
6 14-15	7 14-15	D (0.9-1.1)	01-11		
16-17	16-17	D- (0.7-0.8)	Challenge and		
18-19	18-19	E (0.0)	Engagement Index		
20-21	20-21	Pass	CEI = 5.5		
6 22 or more	7 22 or more	Credit			
Respondents: 16	Respondents: 15	No Credit	(1=lowest; 7=highest)		
Class median: 6.5	Class median: 5.8	Respondents: 15			
Hours per credit: 2.2	Hours per credit: 1.9	Class median: 3,5			