

SEMESTER: SPRING 2009

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM REPORT
STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THIS CLASS: 24 COMPLETED FORMS: 18

June 2, 2009
12103510

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

NAME: Dourado, Eli F
COLLEGE: Humanities & Social Sciences
DEPT: Economics
COURSE: ECON 370
SECTION: 001

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	6	4	6
Times absent from cls: 1=0-1 2=2-3 3=4-5 4=6-7 5=8 or more	9	4	4	1	0
Expected Grades: 1=F 2=D 3=C 4=B 5=A	0	0	2	8	8
Class Level: 1=Fresh 2=Soph 3=Jr 4=Sr 5=Grad	0	1	7	9	0
Ovr'lll GPA: 1=below 2.0 2=2-2.5 3=2.51-3.0 4=3.01-3.5 5=3.51-4	0	0	7	6	4
Course is: 5=required 4=elective 3=gen ed 2=Other	0	0	10	7	0

PERCENTAGES

ITEMS	(1) D	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) S	(6) NA	AREA	MEAN	MEDIAN	S.D	# Resp.
1. Course re'mts were clearly stated in the syllabus	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.8	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.00	18
	1.2	1.3	6.6	19.4	71.6	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.59	5.0	0.77	1,998
	0.7	1.2	4.5	16.9	76.5	0.2	COL/SCHL/INST	4.68	5.0	0.68	23,997
	0.8	1.3	5.2	19.6	72.8	0.3	UNIVERSITY	4.63	5.0	0.72	67,975
2. The course was well organized	5.6	0.0	5.6	16.7	72.2	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.06	18
	1.5	2.9	9.3	22.8	63.4	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.44	5.0	0.89	1,979
	1.2	2.5	7.9	21.2	67.0	0.1	COL/SCHL/INST	4.51	5.0	0.84	23,854
	1.5	2.9	8.8	23.0	63.8	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.45	5.0	0.88	67,672
3. The instructor explained the material clearly	5.6	0.0	5.6	22.2	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.44	5.0	1.03	18
	2.4	3.4	11.9	24.3	58.0	0.1	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.32	5.0	0.97	1,988
	1.2	2.9	8.9	22.3	64.5	0.1	COL/SCHL/INST	4.46	5.0	0.87	23,951
	1.7	3.6	10.5	24.0	60.1	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.37	5.0	0.93	67,867
4. Comments and suggestions on returned material helpfu	5.6	0.0	5.6	22.2	61.1	5.6	CLASS	4.41	5.0	1.06	18
	2.7	5.1	11.5	21.5	50.5	8.7	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.23	5.0	1.06	1,978
	1.8	3.3	9.4	20.3	60.9	4.2	COL/SCHL/INST	4.41	5.0	0.93	23,876
	2.3	4.0	10.5	20.5	55.1	7.6	UNIVERSITY	4.32	5.0	1.00	67,583
5. The instructor showed respect for students	0.0	0.0	5.6	11.1	83.3	0.0	CLASS	4.78	5.0	0.54	18
	0.8	1.4	4.4	14.3	79.1	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.70	5.0	0.69	1,987
	0.8	1.2	3.3	12.1	82.5	0.0	COL/SCHL/INST	4.74	5.0	0.65	23,857
	0.9	1.4	4.1	14.3	79.3	0.1	UNIVERSITY	4.70	5.0	0.70	67,607
6. The instructor was acces-sible in person or electron	5.6	0.0	0.0	22.2	72.2	0.0	CLASS	4.56	5.0	0.97	18
	1.1	1.9	7.0	18.2	68.8	3.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.56	5.0	0.80	1,980
	0.9	1.6	5.4	15.4	75.3	1.4	COL/SCHL/INST	4.65	5.0	0.74	23,835
	1.0	1.8	6.1	17.4	71.6	2.1	UNIVERSITY	4.60	5.0	0.77	67,474
7. The instructor followed the stated crs. grading p'l	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.8	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.00	18
	0.5	1.3	4.0	16.8	75.3	2.1	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.69	5.0	0.66	1,971
	0.5	0.8	4.1	15.1	78.0	1.4	COL/SCHL/INST	4.72	5.0	0.63	23,884
	0.6	0.9	4.4	16.3	73.5	4.2	UNIVERSITY	4.68	5.0	0.67	67,661
8. The exams reflected what was covered in the course	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.8	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.00	18
	1.2	2.6	7.0	18.0	65.3	5.8	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.52	5.0	0.85	1,975
	0.9	1.6	5.1	15.2	62.4	14.8	COL/SCHL/INST	4.60	5.0	0.77	23,650
	1.1	2.0	5.9	15.9	57.8	17.2	UNIVERSITY	4.54	5.0	0.84	67,061
9. The as'mnts helped me learn the material	5.6	0.0	5.6	11.1	55.6	22.2	CLASS	4.43	5.0	1.14	18
	2.2	3.6	8.9	20.7	56.3	8.4	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.37	5.0	0.98	1,984
	1.7	3.1	8.6	21.5	62.1	3.0	COL/SCHL/INST	4.43	5.0	0.91	23,843
	2.0	3.5	9.4	22.1	58.5	4.6	UNIVERSITY	4.38	5.0	0.95	67,439
10. Readings helped me understa the course topic	5.6	0.0	16.7	16.7	61.1	0.0	CLASS	4.28	5.0	1.14	18
	2.1	3.9	10.4	24.2	56.9	2.6	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.33	5.0	0.96	1,979
	1.7	3.2	9.9	22.4	60.4	2.5	COL/SCHL/INST	4.40	5.0	0.92	23,765
	2.2	3.7	11.4	23.1	54.3	5.3	UNIVERSITY	4.30	5.0	0.98	67,309

SEMESTER: SPRING 2009

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
 STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL RATING SYSTEM REPORT
 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THIS CLASS: 24 COMPLETED FORMS: 18

June 2, 2009
 12103510

INSTRUCTOR INFORMATION

NAME: Dourado, Eli F
 COLLEGE: Humanities & Social Sciences
 DEPT: Economics
 COURSE: ECON 370
 SECTION: 001

RESPONSE KEY

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

ITEMS	PERCENTAGES						AREA	MEAN	MEDIAN	S.D	# Resp.
	(1) D	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) S	(6) NA					
11. Ass'mnts and exams were returned properly	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.8	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.00	18
	0.9	2.2	6.0	19.0	69.7	2.3	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.58	5.0	0.78	1,971
	1.4	2.2	7.6	20.3	66.6	1.9	COL/SCHL/INST	4.51	5.0	0.85	23,751
	1.7	2.5	7.8	20.1	62.0	5.9	UNIVERSITY	4.47	5.0	0.89	67,198
12. The ins'tr covered the im'p aspect of the course	5.6	0.0	5.6	27.8	61.1	0.0	CLASS	4.39	5.0	1.03	18
	1.1	1.8	5.8	18.7	72.5	0.2	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.60	5.0	0.77	1,985
	0.8	1.3	5.3	17.3	75.1	0.3	COL/SCHL/INST	4.65	5.0	0.71	23,898
	0.9	1.6	6.2	20.2	70.7	0.4	UNIVERSITY	4.59	5.0	0.75	67,705
13. The ins'tr made the class intellectually stimulating	5.6	0.0	0.0	27.8	66.7	0.0	CLASS	4.50	5.0	1.00	18
	3.4	3.3	10.6	20.7	62.0	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.34	5.0	1.02	1,980
	2.3	3.4	9.2	19.6	65.4	0.1	COL/SCHL/INST	4.42	5.0	0.96	23,819
	3.1	4.2	11.0	21.3	60.1	0.2	UNIVERSITY	4.31	5.0	1.03	67,510
14. The ins'tr encouraged the students to be involved	5.6	0.0	0.0	16.7	77.8	0.0	CLASS	4.61	5.0	0.97	18
	3.0	4.3	11.6	21.9	56.9	2.3	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.28	5.0	1.04	1,977
	1.4	2.5	7.5	17.7	70.4	0.5	COL/SCHL/INST	4.54	5.0	0.85	23,736
	2.0	3.4	9.1	19.5	65.2	0.7	UNIVERSITY	4.43	5.0	0.94	67,268

OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTION AND COURSE
 PERCENTAGES

ITEMS	PERCENTAGES						AREA	MEAN	MEDIAN	S.D	# Resp.
	(1) POOR	(2)	(3) OK	(4)	(5) EX'L	(6) NA					
15. My overall rating of the teaching	5.6	0.0	0.0	16.7	77.8	0.0	CLASS	4.61	5.0	0.97	18
	2.3	3.1	11.2	23.4	59.9	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.36	5.0	0.96	1,966
	1.6	2.4	9.5	21.9	64.7	0.0	COL/SCHL/INST	4.46	5.0	0.88	23,607
	1.9	2.9	11.1	23.8	60.2	0.0	UNIVERSITY	4.37	5.0	0.93	66,879
16. My overall rating of this course	0.0	5.6	0.0	38.9	55.6	0.0	CLASS	4.44	5.0	0.77	18
	2.2	4.1	15.4	28.6	49.7	0.0	DEPT/PROGRAM	4.19	4.0	0.99	1,947
	1.8	3.7	14.4	27.3	52.8	0.0	COL/SCHL/INST	4.26	5.0	0.96	23,382
	2.6	4.3	15.9	27.9	49.4	0.0	UNIVERSITY	4.17	4.0	1.01	66,315

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.

In addition to ranking the class on a 1-5 scale in several dimensions, students were asked to answer two questions in a free format (though some chose to comment without regard to these):

1. What aspects of the course and the way it was taught helped you to learn?
2. What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

I have included all of the written comments submitted.

Really enjoyed the class

Did a great job at explaining things so it would make sense

Favorite teacher by far

Don't charge a thing... great course.
Just add extra credit opp (simple small stuff),
eg. in exam extra credit questions, or posts in
blogs. OR participation in class gives you extra
Credit points.

1. This Course was brilliantly Organized and Synthetically structured. Enabled us to Combine all Various theories + aspects of Economics, from Micro to Macro; Neo-Classical-KAYNES-Austrian, Public Choice + Law/Econ. Components helped Show Real World Applications.
2. Practice Problems for the MATH Component as a "Completion" grade would have been hugely beneficial.
 - Theory Essay's (pp. 4-6) on topic application would have helped solidify Concepts + thought Organization.
- 3.) Overall, highly impressed! Best Class taught by a Grad. Student yet!