



## **201607-ECON306-0201-INTERMED MICROECON THRY - Prateik Dalmia - Instructor Report - Summer 2 2016**

### **University of Maryland Course Evaluation Summer 2 2016 (courses ending after 7/17)**

Number of Students Enrolled: 23

Number of Evaluations Submitted: 11

Response Rate: 47.8%

#### **Report Comments**

This report presents feedback received from students for the course **INTERMED MICROECON THRY** and for the Instructor **Prateik Dalmia** in that course. Course means are provided as well as department, college, and college course-level means (e.g., all 200-level courses in a college). Means are calculated from all responses by all students in the unit (i.e., course section, department, college, course-level in a college) on that item and exclude N/A (not applicable) responses. A grade table is included on the next page.

Indication is provided below for the Report Group if there is one affiliated with this course section, otherwise it is blank. The Report Group will be the lead section of a grouped course (i.e. multi-section lecture) and/or the primary of cross-listed courses.

**Semester: 201607**

**College: College of Behavioral & Social Sciences**

**Department: BSOS-Economics**

**Course #: ECON306**

**Section #: 0201**

**Course Title: INTERMED MICROECON THRY**

**Report Group:**

**Instructor: Prateik Dalmia**

**Creation Date** Wed, Apr 18, 2018



## Grade Distribution

Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Grade D	Grade F	Grade PS	Grade W
8	9	3	0	1	0	0

Grade distribution is current as of August 26, 2016 and includes students receiving a W for the course. Some grades are not included (e.g., Cancel, Incomplete).

## Administrator University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.27	3.38	3.20	3.21
I learned a lot from this course.	3.09	3.42	3.44	3.41
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.31</b>

### By Frequency

1. The course was intellectually challenging.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	5	45.5%
Strongly Agree	4	5	45.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.27
Standard Deviation	0.90

2. I learned a lot from this course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	2	18.2%
Agree	3	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	5	45.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.09
Standard Deviation	1.04

### How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
General Education or CORE Requirement	0	1	9.1%
Major/Certificate/Minor/Program Requirement	1	10	90.9%
Elective	2	0	0.0%

## Additional comments (e.g. about course content/materials, teaching style, etc.):

### Comments

Teaching style. The instructor should learn to read the room better, just because students don't raise their hands to ask questions doesn't mean they understand. The instructor should be able to read facial expressions and body language to be able to tell at least when a majority of the class is not following the lecture. Also, for a three hour class, the breaks should be used not only for students to walk around but for conversations and interactive activities that will help the class and instructor feel more relaxed. Overall the instructor did a good job with the course load and time provided

Prateik was a great teacher, but sometimes he may have dumbed it down a little. I was not expecting a thorough teaching of derivatives in a 300 level class, when this was taught in highschool. Nonetheless he was able to bring color to the material with great real world examples that really brought the material to life.

Course content was broken up well making normally complicated topics easy to understand and teaching style ended up being exactly what I needed to pass the class!

The teacher should slow down. In the first half of the class he made many mistakes, switching P1 with P2 or x2 with x1, and this makes it very confusing because it will be unclear in students' notes what the real answer is. He should also slow down to explain things thoroughly and perhaps he should really explain his simplification and algebra, since many students haven't taken a math class in quite a while.

## Administrator University-Wide Instructor Prateik Dalmia Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.  
N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The instructor treated students with respect.	3.82	3.77	3.74	3.75
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	3.64	3.62	3.61	3.75
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.27	3.36	3.47	3.54
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.68</b>

### By Frequency

1. The instructor treated students with respect.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	9	81.8%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.82
Standard Deviation	0.40

2. The instructor was well-prepared for class.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	4	36.4%
Strongly Agree	4	7	63.6%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.64
Standard Deviation	0.50

3. Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	3	27.3%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	6	54.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.27
Standard Deviation	0.90

## Overall Score

Averaging the following five scaled Administrator items (from above, repeated below) results in the Overall Score.

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Competency	Course
The course was intellectually challenging.	3.27
I learned a lot from this course.	3.09
The instructor treated students with respect.	3.82
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	3.64
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	3.27
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>3.42</b>

The standards the instructor Prateik Dalmia set for students were...

## By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The standards the instructor set for students were...	1.27	1.10	1.03	1.04

## By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	8	72.7%
Too High	2	3	27.3%

## Student University-Wide Course Items Applied to All Section Instructors

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Course guidelines were clearly described in the syllabus.	3.36	3.40	3.49	3.64

### By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	2	18.2%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	1	9.1%
Strongly Agree	4	8	72.7%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.36
Standard Deviation	1.21

Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were

### By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Based on the quality of my work in this course, the grades I earned were	0.82	0.95	0.94	0.88

### By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	3	27.3%
Appropriate	1	7	63.6%
Too High	2	1	9.1%

Given the course level and number of credits the workload was

## By Score

Scale is Too Low (0) to Too High (2) with an Appropriate mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Given the course level and number of credits, the workload was	1.18	1.07	1.06	1.12

## By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Too Low	0	0	0.0%
Appropriate	1	9	81.8%
Too High	2	2	18.2%

How much effort did you put into the course?

## By Score

Scale is Little (0) to Considerable (2) with a Moderate mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
How much effort did you put into the course?	1.55	1.63	1.59	1.62

## By Frequency

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Little	0	1	9.1%
Moderate	1	3	27.3%
Considerable	2	7	63.6%



## Student University-Wide Instructor Prateik Dalmia Items

Results for use by faculty/instructors and students.

N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS-Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.	3.45	3.38	3.49	3.62
The instructor was responsive to student concerns.	3.45	3.43	3.56	3.62
The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.	3.18	3.25	3.45	3.53

### By Frequency

1. The instructor was effective in communicating the content of the course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	2	18.2%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	7	63.6%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.45
Standard Deviation	0.82

2. The instructor was responsive to student concerns.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	1	9.1%
Agree	3	1	9.1%
Strongly Agree	4	8	72.7%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.45
Standard Deviation	1.04

3. The instructor helped create an atmosphere that kept me engaged in course content.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	3	27.3%
Agree	3	0	0.0%
Strongly Agree	4	7	63.6%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.18
Standard Deviation	1.17

## College-Wide Instructor Prateik Dalmia Items - Behavioral & Social Sciences

Results for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes.  
N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

### By Score

Scale is Strongly Disagree (0) to Strongly Agree (4) with a Neutral mid-point

Question	Course	Department (BSOS- Economics)	College (BSOS)	Course Level (BSOS_300)
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Overall, this was an excellent course.	2.82	3.19	3.32	3.30
I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.	3.00	3.21	3.41	3.44
Grades were assigned fairly and impartially.	3.45	3.37	3.38	3.45
The teaching methods in this course helped me learn the material.	3.09	3.09	3.21	3.22
Examinations covered the important aspects of this course.	3.64	3.34	3.38	3.42
The instructor presented material clearly.	3.36	3.31	3.37	3.47
The instructor provided timely feedback about my progress in this course.	3.27	3.07	3.22	3.24
The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.	3.82	3.53	3.63	3.71
The instructor used class time well.	3.73	3.40	3.44	3.68
The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.	3.82	3.46	3.50	3.66

# By Frequency

1. Overall, this was an excellent course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	1	9.1%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	3	27.3%
Agree	3	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	4	36.4%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	2.82
Standard Deviation	1.25

2. I gained a good understanding of concepts/principles in this field.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	1	9.1%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	2	18.2%
Agree	3	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	5	45.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.00
Standard Deviation	1.26

3. Grades were assigned fairly and impartially.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	1	9.1%
Agree	3	4	36.4%
Strongly Agree	4	6	54.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.45
Standard Deviation	0.69

4. The teaching methods in this course helped me learn the material.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	3	27.3%
Agree	3	1	9.1%
Strongly Agree	4	6	54.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.09
Standard Deviation	1.14

5. Examinations covered the important aspects of this course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	1	9.1%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	8	72.7%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.64
Standard Deviation	0.67

6. The instructor presented material clearly.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	3	27.3%
Agree	3	1	9.1%
Strongly Agree	4	7	63.6%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.36
Standard Deviation	0.92

## By Frequency (continued)

7. The instructor provided timely feedback about my progress in this course.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	1	9.1%
Neutral	2	1	9.1%
Agree	3	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	6	54.5%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.27
Standard Deviation	1.01

9. The instructor used class time well.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	8	72.7%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.73
Standard Deviation	0.47

8. The instructor appeared to have a thorough knowledge of the subject.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	9	81.8%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.82
Standard Deviation	0.40

10. The instructor seemed well prepared for each class.

Options	Score	Count	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	0	0.0%
Neutral	2	0	0.0%
Agree	3	2	18.2%
Strongly Agree	4	9	81.8%

Statistics	Value
Response Count	11
Mean	3.82
Standard Deviation	0.40

**End of Report**