

SEMESTER: SPRING 2010

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM REPORT
STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THIS CLASS: 39 COMPLETED FORMS: 24

June 1, 2010
20040140

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

NAME: Runst, Petrik
COLLEGE: Humanities & Social Sciences
DEPT: Economics
COURSE: ECON 306
SECTION: 008

RESPONSE KEY

S STRONGLY AGREE . . . (5)
. (4)
. (3)
. (2)
D STRONGLY DISAGREE . . . (1)
NA NOT APPLICABLE . . . (6)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

	1	2	3	4	5
Am't of effort put into the course: 1 very low 5=very high	0	1	8	9	4
Times absent from cls: 1=0-1 2=2-3 3=4-5 4=6-7 5=8 or more	14	3	2	1	2
Expected Grades: 1=F 2=D 3=C 4=B 5=A	0	0	2	11	9
Class Level: 1=Fresh 2=Soph 3=Jr 4=Sr 5=Grad	0	2	13	5	0
Ovr'll GPA: 1=below 2.0 2=2-2.5 3=2.51-3.0 4=3.01-3.5 5=3.51-4	1	0	3	9	9
Course is: 5=required 4=elective 3=gen ed 2=Other	0	1	7	13	0

ITEMS	PERCENTAGES						AREA	MEAN	MEDIAN	S.D	# Resp.
	(1) D	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) S	(6) NA					
1. Course requirements and expectations were clear	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.1	60.9	0.0	CLASS	4.61	5.0	0.48	23
	0.6	1.7	7.0	24.0	66.8	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.55	5.0	0.75	1,910
	0.9	1.7	5.8	20.8	70.8	0.0	COL/SCHL/INST	4.59	5.0	0.75	24,127
	1.0	2.1	6.8	22.5	67.5	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.53	5.0	0.80	54,186
2. The course was well organized	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.2	70.8	0.0	CLASS	4.71	5.0	0.47	24
	0.9	2.8	9.7	24.1	62.5	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.44	5.0	0.85	1,900
	1.4	2.5	8.6	21.5	65.9	0.1	COL/SCHL/INST	4.48	5.0	0.86	23,980
	1.6	3.0	9.3	23.0	63.1	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.43	5.0	0.89	53,848
3. The instructor helped me to better understand the course material	0.0	0.0	8.7	34.8	56.5	0.0	CLASS	4.48	5.0	0.67	23
	1.3	3.0	10.9	23.2	61.4	0.2	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.41	5.0	0.89	1,902
	1.4	2.9	8.7	21.3	65.5	0.2	COL/SCHL/INST	4.47	5.0	0.87	24,068
	1.7	3.3	9.5	22.3	63.0	0.3	UNIVERSITY	4.42	5.0	0.91	54,059
4. Feedback (comments and suggestions written on papers, solutions provided, class disc, etc) was helpful	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	62.5	4.2	CLASS	4.65	5.0	0.48	24
	2.2	3.9	13.5	22.4	50.7	7.2	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.25	5.0	1.01	1,910
	1.8	3.4	10.7	21.4	59.5	3.3	COL/SCHL/INST	4.38	5.0	0.94	24,029
	2.1	3.9	10.4	21.0	56.9	5.7	UNIVERSITY	4.35	5.0	0.98	53,856
5. The instructor showed respect for students	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	91.7	0.0	CLASS	4.92	5.0	0.29	24
	0.2	0.7	3.0	14.7	81.4	0.1	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.77	5.0	0.55	1,903
	0.7	1.2	3.5	12.0	82.6	0.1	COL/SCHL/INST	4.75	5.0	0.64	24,040
	0.8	1.3	4.0	13.3	80.5	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.72	5.0	0.67	53,966
6. The instructor was accessible in person or electronically	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	87.5	0.0	CLASS	4.79	5.0	0.59	24
	0.9	1.6	7.1	19.1	69.4	1.9	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.57	5.0	0.78	1,895
	0.7	1.4	5.4	16.0	75.0	1.5	COL/SCHL/INST	4.66	5.0	0.72	23,873
	0.8	1.7	5.9	16.7	72.7	2.3	UNIVERSITY	4.62	5.0	0.75	53,549
7. The course grading policy was clear	0.0	4.2	4.2	12.5	79.2	0.0	CLASS	4.67	5.0	0.75	24
	0.9	2.1	7.4	18.3	70.8	0.5	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.57	5.0	0.79	1,914
	1.2	2.3	7.2	19.6	69.3	0.3	COL/SCHL/INST	4.54	5.0	0.82	24,097
	1.3	2.3	7.6	20.2	67.2	1.4	UNIVERSITY	4.52	5.0	0.84	54,067
8. Graded work reflected what was covered in the course	0.0	4.2	12.5	16.7	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.46	5.0	0.88	24
	0.8	2.2	7.5	18.7	68.4	2.4	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.55	5.0	0.80	1,887
	0.9	1.9	6.6	19.1	70.2	1.3	COL/SCHL/INST	4.58	5.0	0.78	23,900
	1.1	2.2	6.8	19.5	65.9	4.6	UNIVERSITY	4.54	5.0	0.81	53,567
9. The assignments helped me learn the material	0.0	8.3	4.2	25.0	50.0	12.5	CLASS	4.33	5.0	0.97	24
	1.5	2.9	9.6	20.5	57.2	8.2	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.41	5.0	0.92	1,892
	1.5	3.0	9.2	21.6	62.4	2.3	COL/SCHL/INST	4.44	5.0	0.90	23,852
	1.7	3.2	9.4	21.8	60.3	3.6	UNIVERSITY	4.41	5.0	0.92	53,465
10. The textbook and/or assigned readings helped me understand the material	0.0	4.2	16.7	20.8	58.3	0.0	CLASS	4.33	5.0	0.91	24
	2.6	3.8	11.8	22.1	56.8	2.9	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.30	5.0	1.01	1,897
	2.3	3.7	10.7	22.3	58.3	2.7	COL/SCHL/INST	4.34	5.0	0.97	23,824
	2.8	4.3	11.5	22.6	53.8	5.1	UNIVERSITY	4.27	5.0	1.03	53,472

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

NAME: Runst, Petrik
COLLEGE: Humanities & Social Sciences
DEPT: Economics
COURSE: ECON 306
SECTION: 008

RESPONSE KEY

S . . . STRONGLY AGREE . . . (5)
. (4)
. (3)
. (2)
D . . . STRONGLY DISAGREE . . . (1)
NA . . . NOT APPLICABLE . . . (6)

Table with 12 columns: ITEMS, (1) D, (2), (3), (4), (5) S, (6) NA, AREA, MEAN, MEDIAN, S.D, # Resp. Rows include items like 'Assignments and exams were returned in a reasonable amount of time' and 'The instructor covered the important aspects of the course'.

OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE

Table with 12 columns: ITEMS, (1) POOR, (2), (3) OK, (4), (5) EX'L, (6) NA, AREA, MEAN, MEDIAN, S.D, # Resp. Rows include items like 'My overall rating of the teaching' and 'My overall rating of this course'.

Median is the middlemost of the ranked scores. S.D (Standard Deviation) is a measure of the dispersion of scores from the mean. For example, if all students agree that Prof. X is excellently prepared, the mean would be 5, and the standard deviation would be 0. NA responses and non-respondents are represented in percentages, but not in other calculations.

Large table with multiple columns and rows, likely a continuation of the data or a detailed breakdown of the survey results. The text is partially obscured and difficult to read.

1. The most helpful part of the class was the fact that the professor elicited discussion from the class. Many professors do not direct questions to the class but instead only lecture. These professors ~~do~~ provide substantially less opportunity to ~~for~~ apply the material and to receive feedback.

2. Petrik is a passionate teacher who clearly cares about the material and whether the class learns the material. Please keep up the good work!

- 1) Good examples, graphs, and outline notes posted to blackboard
- 2) Better Preparation or Review for Midterms, More of what we cover in class or on blackboard, related to exam.

I really enjoyed Petrik's class, it's probably the only class I've never skipped in my entire college career. His teaching style is amazing and he makes the subject understandable and fun (even when I hate economics).